

## 朝向個體的歷程：淺談二十一世紀的台灣錄像

「以消蝕政治生活 (*polis*) 來解放個體，並無法相應地強化其抗力，  
而相對地會消除抗力，同時消除掉個體性，  
就像後來在極權國家中發生的那樣：  
讓這項構成許多根本衝突之一的原因，  
帶領著十九世紀社會朝向法西斯主義前進。」

阿多諾，〈單子〉 in 《低限道德》，1951

### 從反奇觀的「問題性」開始：2010-2011

2010 年的冬天，陳界仁的《帝國邊界 II：西方公司》與姚瑞中與 LSD 的《海市蜃樓》，標誌出台灣政治藝術在影像上的高度表達；陳界仁以累積許多年的創作關係，讓影像創作不再單純地完成一個可投影的影像作品，而成為將社群連結和生產關係進行整合的過程與操作，影像也因此更為明確地與過程中形成的社群建立密不可分的關係，影像因為自身的生產關係而作為社群行動；而姚瑞中則以課程機制組裝出 LSD，將攝影教學實現為藝術調研，讓攝影的影像作為某種證據，並匯聚成一種奇觀，讓這個以厚達六公分的書再現的奇觀，轉化為政府資源浪費的奇觀。而 2011 年王俊傑的錄像新作《若絲計劃：愛與死》，企圖以杜象作品《給予：1 瀑布，2 照明的煤氣》的模擬改寫，對台灣當代影像藝術的奇觀化與空洞化提出質疑，企圖在台灣當代藝術喧嘩中重新看待藝術的「前衛」問題，一方面回到藝術與人之間的神祕連結，另一方面則對於台灣當代藝術以代工的模式複製大量的國際樣式：意即「奇觀」。

從這三個藝術創作事件來看，陳界仁開始以生產力和生產關係的內容，來思考影像創作的問題，也就是將生產自身文件化、進行佈署，以作為影像創作行為的實質，這是一種標誌著人民書寫的另類奇觀，對抗著「西方公司」模式所栽培出的代工奇觀；而姚瑞中延續他處理廢墟的行動式攝影，用身體穿越無人或禁止進入之地，進行地理學式的調研，累積出為量可觀的高反差攝影，讓原本同樣無形的錯誤文化政策與浪費國庫的惡質政治具象化為奇觀；而王俊傑的作品一方面以對藝術提問，而觸及到藝術發言權的身分問題，另一方面則面對在台灣一個憑藉著雙年展而發展出來的政治藝術趨勢，以批判性回溯和性的形式反對這快速形式化、物化的藝術奇觀。明顯地，「反奇觀」將成為台灣影像創作者接下來極為重要的思考課題，特別的是這股反奇觀的潛在動力，似乎平行著台灣政府對於都市更新與教育競爭這兩大奇觀的強勢政治，在兩造之間正綿密地交織著許許多多不同的辯證關係。

就 2010 年的台灣當代藝術現象而言，表象上確實出現了「平穩」的狀態，這種相對於全球經濟緊縮以及美國貨幣政策的威脅而出現的「平穩」，諸如藝術

家展覽不斷、策展主題的繁殖、市場的邀約、作品與展演形式的規格化等等，都是「奇觀式」的生產，這些變得不痛不癢的「生產」事實上並非藝術發展漸趨明確化、藝術與社會的積極互動或是市場機制的正常化，而是藝術創作勞動力更為快速地進入城市和社會的資權分配關係。傳統文化工業的好萊塢奇觀已經退居二線，但成為普遍共識所認同的「差異」已無需對抗任何「同一性奇觀」，因為同一性的奇觀不再是表象符號的奇觀，而是生產關係越來越趨向同一化的「反身性」(reflexivity)奇觀，一方面是外部龐大的體制化，另一方面則是不斷深化的「生命政治」：台灣藝術家從事的創作與展演，越來越像是赤裸人以過度勞動所完成的「母體」(Matrix)奇觀。

「錄像」這一越來越難界定的藝術範疇，無疑地是「反身性」植入最深也最為敏感的場域，因為數位影像在機具的平價化、網路傳輸的加速以及展演上的彈性，讓錄像的影像思考脫離介於「自我詩性」與「藝術自身」之間的無人稱狀態，而極化為「自我詩性」與「佈署位置」兩端的個體性思考，前者用細膩的知識與資訊保障脆弱不堪的主體表達，後者則將自身內化為操作單元，進入功利導向的鬥爭場域，名符其實地成為東浩紀指稱的「資料動物」(database animal)，「資料動物」幾乎就是全球化之後「反身性」的「後人類」典型。

這種人格化典型在台灣當代錄像的創作中，除了平穩地生產出品質不錯的作品清單之外，卻不禁令人失望地看到「藝術=再生產」，甚至「再生產」成為許多焦慮的圈內人所企求的「穩定性」，生產性的創造性意涵在粗淺的商業機制與行政官僚過快實現的承諾中快速消逝。相對於這種再生產與穩定化——也就注定其社會連繫的正常化——的藝術生產，反向地激勵出兩種不同的影像走向：虛構傳說與機器行為。「虛構傳說」主要以「偽紀錄片」或「諧擬消費影像」讓貼近個體與環境的日常呈現出一種異質性的感受，逃逸出象徵與寓言的現代主義框架和組織化資本主義框架的一種創造性再現，例如吳其育將日常「大特寫化」的《林口怪獸》和《蟑螂屋》、高雅婷將建國百年「精靈化」的《千年》、林冠名的【N年之後】。「機器行為」不再將機器當作影像再現的潛文本，也不是將機器視為媒體批判的隱喻，而是規劃出機器與創作行動的聯動方案，既跨越麥克魯漢媒體與身體的同一化與交互隱喻，也不同于最初系統論的媒體先驗論傾向，而是將拒絕機器的身體自主性與迷戀機器的合體化予以並置的「行為-錄像」，如蘇育賢面對視訊進行互動速寫的《網路聊天室寫生》，以及江忠倫的《水星人》和鍾亭的《快閃悲劇的熱情殺手》等，將商業與媒體操作的諧擬，置入藝術教育體制中的論文口考機制，將論述的對質轉變為扮裝表演與行為互動。

事實上，還存在著第三種比例上為數最少的影像操作，不是諧擬的微型反諷，而批判性地以「翻譯」和「轉位」切入年輕創作者自身在全球化中的生產處境，如饒家恩的《創作自述》、余政達的教學錄像等。這三個方向雖說是台灣當代年輕藝術家所突顯的幾種發展，但它們並不能被化約地歸結為台灣青藝術家的「風格」或「議題」，因為，我們可以看到陳界仁在《帝國邊界 II》中同時將這三種方向跨越過「趣味性」的「慧點」，而推至政治與歷史的邊界，換言之，跨

越過物的媒體化與媒體的物化間的曖昧狀態，儘管這是極為真實的困境，而挑戰著「立場」的表明，努力跳脫徹底且全面的「相對性」：因為這「相對性」能夠表達的充其量是藝術菁英對於知識的操練，以極為抽象、投機而無人稱的立場消解著無人稱的微型革命力量，另一方面這不斷轉向變相的「相對性」正是文化官僚與非組織性資本主義足以收納各種力量的利器。

這是一個必須從微型感性的交織與動態中，所生成之影像行為切入並進行思考的歷史性必要時刻：跳脫「相對性」的必要時刻。這個時刻標示出當代藝術不再擁有任何具社會代表性的位置，能夠同體制進行對立或意識型態的抗爭，這不只是因為體制快速地吸收個人的創意與意見，更因為每個人不只是自由的個體，而且每個反身性主體就是國家、體制，甚至就是「公司」。這種反身性成為一種內在同質化的「生命管理」，而取消掉現代主義論者期許的「反思」。畢竟「反思」在今天的專業領域與評鑑機制中皆翻轉為「演出」與「記錄」。而無論是「虛構傳說」、「機器行為」與「翻譯轉位」正好都企圖逃離錄像與身體、日常之間的既定形式與合法關係：即「演出」與「記錄」。

因應種種內外依變的條件轉換，除了上述的創作契機之外，台灣高度倚賴學院養成與生產的當代藝術，在近未來的挑戰將是一種奇特而吊詭的「回返社會」。教育政策在普遍校園中強力植入的「服務學習」（意即「社會責任與服務的教育項目」），讓社會問題實在化為個體的道德感與實踐，意即由國家機器對於 NGO 的間接肯認，全面地去除社會議題中的意識型態問題，甚至去除某些社會議題。這個運作確實突破了當代藝術論述社會議題的無力與無效，因為在大量作品與雙年展展場中，社會議題只是奇觀的一部份，甚至作為日常生活的互補項次。但這種反身性的強化，無法如德勒茲的想像——事實上他清楚地反對反身性——完成一種社會連結的獨特內在性，它帶給年輕人的獨特性幻象只是更為狹隘的社會空間分配與無償勞動的分配，反而更為全面地將內在性自同質化的內在驅除。簡言之，這種「回返社會」極可能去除獨特內在性與社會議題特殊性的創造性動力。

## 媒體奇觀與物化的現實

數位與網路技術使得訊息能夠以電流的高速進行傳遞，致使再生產的速度遠超過形成生產性所需的條件，這種逐漸取消生產力與生產性的「再生產」——無止盡的擬像——就是將藝術創作媒體化，並誘引將所有媒體予以物化的新生產力。無論是陳界仁、姚瑞中與王俊傑對於奇觀的批判與質疑，或是蘇育賢、吳其育和江忠倫以體制化生產方式放大微型主體性，完成以奇觀自嘲到反諷奇觀的歷程，抑或是細緻地操作感性與批判性之關連的饒家恩和余政達，挑戰著奇觀內在的細微邏輯，我們可以看到他們都清楚地意識到這種資訊化與網路化所造就的「全球文化工業」；也因為這種全球文化工業本身不斷地通過消費行為，以「物—媒體」的主體性不斷地替換「人」的主體性，讓奇觀自身也「流體化」，使得情境主義的「演出行動」在液態化奇觀中變得跟奇觀自身沒有兩樣。

在二十一世紀台灣當代藝術的初期發展中，我們明顯地察覺在全球文化工業

的狀況下，「現實」自身正在全面而徹底地「物化」當中。無論是被物化的對象或是化約而成的環境，現實是一種已然缺席的物自身，並不斷地經由社會製造出取代這物自身的「認知物」。「現實」因為脈絡處境的不同而不斷分裂，同時，「現實」也因為全球化而快速地藉由藝術生產與展演而「物化」。前者是世界史的碎裂，而後者則是超歷史的「去歷史化」。簡言之，現實在知識份子與藝術家的思考中從未能夠外於「物化」，但今天卻更為全面而單一地將現實予以物化，物化為展示品與商品。

藝術家是現實的否定性衍生物，幾乎很少作為現實之同一性而匿名於社群之中。但因為生存與經濟條件的劇烈改變，現實自身出現了危機，並隨著個體性的多樣化而不斷分裂，藝術批判的進展會合上這個時刻，同時間，因為社會社群的普遍焦慮與現有權力關係的作用下，這個問題在現代性的追求中被「半自願地」異化為藝術必須回應現實、回饋現實的要求。在這要求底下，2010年到2011年的台北雙年展與花博「因緣巧合」地有相當展期重疊，從這性質迥異的兩個展覽——前者強調著藝術即作為一種差異性的現實，是一種對藝術的重新詮釋，而後者則是證明台灣文化品味的生活美學大展，強調台灣社會需要或可理解的美感教育——可以看見並未因為這兩個展覽，而促使公民對現實有更積極的想像，或更為關注庸俗美感與現實之間的關係。相反地，我們看到2008年到2010年的發展，比較是「政治藝術」的形式越來越成為年輕藝術家操作與消費「現實」的工具，這就是上述論者企圖標示出的：通過台灣當代藝術的發展，現實正快速地被以著幾種固定模式而「物化」。因為，今天的「現實」能夠在當代藝術的舞台上獲得相當的曝光度，簡言之，現實的物化讓台灣的影像創作不斷地逼近於「歡愉」、「有趣」的媒體奇觀，或說政治藝術與藝術政治都在這生產關係中「影像化」或「錄像化」為媒體奇觀。「現實的普遍、快速物化」無疑地是消解現實潛在意義的危機，而伴隨著這危機，在台灣，能夠被看見的又只有個案現實，而不會有結構性的現實，結構性的現實被結構性地掩藏，個案現實的充血狀態和結構性現實的凹陷狀態所共同抹殺和壓抑的就是「個體－現實」。

## 從電影到錄像

從2008年開始到2011，是台灣當代錄像藝術開始其多樣化的進程，這裡面起催化作用的，主要還在於社會面向與政治議題的介入，讓集中在影像質感與詩意浪漫的影像創作出現了更多外延的途徑。事實上，反全球化與後殖民議題對於台灣影像創作的影響，並不如同之前的照單全收或囫圇吞棗，除了與極少數的錄像藝術家有直接的連結之外，當時這個歐洲當代藝術的新趨勢以一種否定性影響著台灣錄像的創作。在此之前，約莫在2002-2006之間，袁廣鳴關於運動與時間之錯覺的詩意錄像、陳界仁的【加工廠】系列和王俊傑的【微生物協會計劃】都是極為重要的錄像作品，袁廣鳴專注在純化運動與時間在影像中的詩性再現，而後兩者則主要表現為以高密度的影像分別對於歷史書寫和消費社會構成批判性，稍晚，崔廣宇開啟了一種新的身體意識，並以此衍生出台灣行為錄像的另一

種可能性；明顯地，我們可以說台灣的錄像正逐漸地從批判性的感性影像，無論是袁廣鳴、陳界仁或是王俊傑的影像因為創作議題的深刻和投影裝置的形式，都潛在地具有一種「凝思距離」的要求，而崔廣宇的影像卻游移在投影與電視螢幕之間，他經由無知身體在現實場域中進行的無聲行為，製造出一種姿體與語言之間的「差距」，其中的感知過程極為快速，也因此無需固定的思考距離。我們甚至可以說，陳界仁、王俊傑和袁廣鳴的影像構思很大一部份來自於電影影像的經驗，電影的影像也成為他們對抗資本主義消費時代的一種隱喻式形式，但崔廣宇開始表現出與電視影像經驗更為接近的影像創作，他重視的是觀看習癖與微偏差異間的「差距」所呈現的視覺振動。

2004-2008 的重要錄像藝術家有曾御欽、王雅慧和吳季璫，三位藝術家的發展脈絡與氣質都有差異，但卻不約而同地通過「人」或「物」營造出具有奇特知覺的情境。曾御欽善於經過動作與表演的引導，轉化被攝人物的感性狀態與質地，王雅慧則常以空間感的變異狀態製造出奇特的故事性，而吳季璫的創作方式則是以機具的攝像製造出意境。前兩位——早期都曾嘗試過實驗電影的拍攝——擅長於將投影式的電影影像轉化為隱含敘事性的表現性影像，但吳季璫則更純化了物與技術跟再現幻境之間的關係。明顯地，從 2002-2008 的層疊式發展，是一個從電影語言疊加並移轉到暗示性敘事影像與媒體影像這兩個錄像的探索上，而創作個體在這轉化過程中，陳界仁與王俊傑經由電影所彰顯的是社會性個體，是一種通過影像予以象徵化的個體再現，這個象徵化就是個體建立與社會之連繫的方式，相對地，袁廣鳴是媒體影像的詩人，個體在其中體現為生命角色，伴隨的則是對於再現技術的邊界探索。崔廣宇是台灣錄像初步對於個體表演行為的記錄，不同於早期的謝德慶、李銘盛或是息壤，他的身體並不再現銘刻的記憶，也不再現為對抗大他者的身體，而是一個經過遊戲對抗自己的身體，因此他的錄像沒有歷史、只有導向邏輯短路的遊戲。曾御欽與王雅慧則是將暗示敘事性的感性場景化為內在世界的詮釋，但卻因為其內在感性的獨特性，曾御欽藉此製造出一種禁忌與傷害的複合感性，而王雅慧則不斷給出「開啟另一世界」的跳躍。

## 視覺化與媒體化

年輕藝術家通過數位掙脫了新寫實影像所背負的再現重擔，在一種個人主義的發展下，轉而面對一種向社會封閉的自我生活，企圖主觀地讓現實發生變異來宣告自身的存在瞬間；這種認知與實踐確實同樣地得以進行某種「主體化」，可是卻仍然難以真的產生 Manuel Castells 所期許的網路政治，其中最為核心的關鍵就在於網路的使用完全地制約在消費體系所制定的消費框架內，其中自我的宣稱單純地建立在主體形象的操作快感裡，而無能進行任何自創的新共生族群，使得主體化成為一種召喚策略性認同的政治性作為。因此，在 2008 年之後，相反地，出現了一種「反政治訴求」的政治性，過度的媚俗成為這些藝術家抵抗舊有意識型態鬥爭和消費文化的賭注，然而，台灣傾向操作民粹的媚俗體制一方面向這樣的藝術路線示好，另一方面則企圖宣稱一種全球化市場的新認同——即文化創意

產業，「佔據佈署的權力」；無疑地，文化創意產業宣稱的是一種數位產業時代對於「新產值」與「新利潤」的需求，這裡便產生了一個今天年輕藝術家所面對的難題：再現（再生產）邏輯與差異邏輯的鬥爭；文化創意產業作為一種商業發展的現象而言，主要在於感性的「微型差異」應和上利潤的「碎型化」與「離散化」，通過文化的差異迴避資本壟斷的弊病。但當文化創意產業在今天成為全球化競爭的新產品時，「文創產品」只是另一種大眾商品，其中的感性只會進行「細微差異」的複製與再生產，而並非獨特感性自身作為微型差異。所以，這裡存在著一個民主思辯的弔詭之處：「我就是複製」這樣一種本體論的難題。而美術館在官僚政策的操作底下，也成為賦予這本體論難題（也是主體化難題）——意即將差異「自然化」，自然即差異——立即的合法性；事實上，在這種無能宣稱新共生與新認同的狀態下，只會在掏空一切思考與政治之必要的同時，繼承著再現式的權力鬥爭與倫理次序。如此，影像的創造力默默地進入「代工」的倫理框架內，美術館逐漸地在一種沒有自信與努力的行政機制下，放棄建立發言場域的位置，而在政策的主導下讓自身商場化，成為引進全球化話語的進口商。在這一段關於新的生產關係的粗略檢視中，似乎可以想見：統治總是更快地掌握到以再現做為認同基礎的時機，而打破這種權力再生產的政治行動卻又因為倫理框架而無能駕馭影像、錯失創造影像—事件的契機。

在這樣一種商業與政治合體的體制下，也就是 2009-2011 衍生出兩種不同姿態的錄像藝術家；一種是漠然與批判的視覺化姿態，以「內在詩意」全然的隔絕在媒體環境之外，如林冠名、林仁達，或是對於媒體化和感官消費採取批判與懷疑的態度，如饒家恩、周育正、徐建宇，另一種則是享樂、內爆的媒體化姿態，一方面快速地挑戰著自我媒體化，如蘇匯宇、余政達、蘇育賢、謝牧岐、吳其育、黃彥穎、倪祥、復興漢工作室和萬德男孩，另一方面則是亞里斯多德式擬仿的數位行為，如江忠倫、蘇育賢；其中介於兩種姿態之間的藝術家應該就屬余政達、徐建宇、吳其育與倪祥。從林冠名與林仁達的作品來看，電影影像對他們來說已經不是影像的特殊觀點和構成，而是媒體記憶中的影像，但他們卻有著袁廣鳴、陳界仁和王俊傑作品中的影像尺度，不同的是這尺度對於他們而言是來自空間投影的經驗；而饒家恩與周育正則是一種近景距離的影像，也就是電視與錄像的距離，他們的創作思維觸及媒體，但創作內容則是解構媒體的內在邏輯，而徐建宇則是將影像直接視為媒體來運用，也就是工具化的媒體，但他企圖生產抵抗式的反思影像。很明顯地，自我媒體化的藝術家在今天的台灣越來越多，那是一種既可以擺脫陳舊的政治訴求，又可以正當地滿足個人的愉悅，但在一種較為輕盈的思辨下，也就是徹底的相對主義；在其影像的生產與呈現上，首要考慮的不再是質感和距離的問題，而是速度與感官；至於數位行為，主要指的是以網路界面進行行為與影像間的互動和流通，影像的重點在於私密性與即時性，如此來看，媒體化姿態所生產出的影像主要是訴諸感官、速度、私密與即時的微影像。

從這樣的過程來看，個體在今天的台灣社會被兩極化為兩種政治性的選擇，一是強調出政治對質的迫切性，另一則是擺脫所有的社會標籤與責任，強調如何

從政治生活中解脫，但他們不約而同的是更為鮮明的「個體化」。因為即使參與了社會活動，他們也不再經由象徵化來確定位置，而是再現著與個體經驗和行為息息相關的「諸眾」採樣或群像；然而，私密化與即時化之所以能夠被創作個體掌握為創作思考，還在於網路界面提供的呈現與流通，強化的不再是可被凝思的影像，而是可被快速辨識並以相對性獲得諷喻快感的視覺訊息影像。

個體能夠掌握影片的拍攝和製成，影像創作經驗的個體化就是「錄像」的開端。對於大多數二十世紀初期成熟的錄像藝術家而言，「看」的經驗卻是來自於電影，經由這種被概念化與符號化的「看」，個體能夠以各種抽象化的再現來呈現自己；當電影與電視成為生活環境中的影像時，這時候影像變成了語言也變成了環境，個體往往以神秘奇幻的內在或是更為理性客觀的思考，來應對這個媒體世界；可是當數位與網路快速解離與重組這個媒體環境時，個體似乎也隨之進行自身的瓦解與重組，這瓦解與重組在創作個體的表達上就是「平行輸出」與「媒體化的過度」。

在文章的最後，容筆者為了更為清楚地小結上述的論述，而臨時進行的粗略說明：台灣的錄像發展如果粗略分為三個階段，第一個階段是實驗影像的發展（70'-80'），大多以實驗性影像形式的模擬，發展台灣藝術的辯證關係；第二階段（90'末之後）的發展則是專業化影像的創作，在美術館與雙年展的帶領與推動下，投影的空間思考同時回應著美學與政治兩個面向；而第三階段（21e 後）的特徵就是消費經驗與藝術思考相互穿透，影像作為一種溝通與公共媒介，一邊是個體經驗的詩意特寫，一邊則是與環境的直白對話。雖說這三個階段嚴格來說應該穿越了三十年的時光，但實際上第一階段並沒有明確的連續性，而後兩個階段的時間跨度則僅有十多年，因此，在後兩個階段中養成或發展的影像藝術家，都必要同時面對另個階段所開啟的問題和留下的痕跡，而且其中存在於藝術家之間的內在張力是非常巨大的。總地來說，影像不再是被看的對象或是投射的平面，因為身體、場所與時刻之間的分離，或說三者以更多疊層的方式進行交錯接合，影像的必要性也就開始分化，一方面投影本身不再意圖營造中性的影像空間，另一方面影像的出現成為社群事件。第一階段將歐美相關影像去脈絡化，企圖超越性地以其介入台灣的藝術脈絡，第二階段則是進入多元文化與文化翻譯的國際化時代，第三階段則是與資本主義重新建立關係和發起抗爭的時刻。

以另一種觀點切入台灣當代錄像，我們甚至可以說是「微影像」的運動。第一階段是錄像作為邊緣小眾的運動，文藝色彩與社會訴求意味濃厚的小影像，但主要影像內容並不直接反應政治社會問題；第二階段則是將個體情感經驗同歷史脈絡和國際議題作一連結，並在展呈上達成國際展覽的水平，影像內容與表現從形式到意涵開始有可能進行國際的對話；第三階段，創作意圖越來越集中在當代藝術的相關議題，大多以個人詩意跨越這些議題，鮮見能夠持續發展的調研路線，但此時的國際化（全球化）以經脫離內容與對話，而相當程度地集中在操作面上，體制的交換取代了藝術內容的對話。

# The Journey towards Individuality: Brief Discussion on Taiwan Video Art in the 21st Century

That the setting-free of the individual by the undermining of the *polis* did not strengthen his resistance, but eliminated him and individuality itself, in the consummation of dictatorial states, provides a model of one of the central contradictions which drove society from the nineteenth century to Fascism.

Adorno, *Monad* from *Minima Moralia*, 1951

## Beginning from “Problemness” of Anti-spectacle: 2010-2011

In the winter of 2010, *Empire's Borders II – Western Enterprises, Inc* by Chen Chieh-jen and *Mirage* by Yao Jui-chung and LSD marked high expression of Taiwan political art on video. With many years' accumulation of creation relations, Chen Chieh-jen makes video creation the process and operation integrating community links and production relations other than the pure completion of projectable video works. Therefore, video has clearly established close relationship with communities formed in process and are taken as community action because of its own production relation. And Yao Jui-chung has assembled LSD (Lost Society Document) with curriculum mechanism and implemented photography teaching as art research which made photographic images serve as certain evidence and converge into a spectacle, so that the reproduced spectacle of the six-centimeter-thick book has been transformed into the spectacle of wastefulness of government resources. In 2011, Wang Jun-jieh's latest video works, *Project Rrose: Love & Death*, has raised questions on spectacularization and hollowness of contemporary Taiwan video art by attempting to imitate and adapt Duchamp's *Given: 1. The Waterfall, 2. The Illumination Gas* and has tried to take a fresh look at the “avant-garde” issue of art in the hubbub of contemporary Taiwan art. On the one hand, it returns to the mystery links between arts and human, on the other hand, it questions the numerous reproduction of international styles in the way of OEM in contemporary Taiwan art, namely the “spectacle”.

Judging from the three art projects, Chen Chieh-jen started to think about the problem of video art creation with the content of productive forces and production relations, namely, to take the documentization and deployment of production itself as essence of video creation activities. This is a kind of alternative spectacle marking people's writing which fights against the spectacle of OEM growing out of the mode of “Western Enterprises, Inc”. Yao Jui-chung continued his action photography of



processing ruins, traversed uninhabited or forbidden land with his own body and conducted geography-style research to accumulate a considerable amount of photography of high contrast which concretizes the originally invisible and false cultural policies and evil politics of treasury wasting to a spectacle. And Wang Jun-jieh's works, on the one hand, touched the identity issue in the right of art discourse by raising questions on art, and on the other hand, facing a political art trend growing out of Biennials in Taiwan, he opposed the rapidly formalized and materialized art spectacle with critical retrospective and form of sex. Obviously, "anti-spectacle" will become an important subject to ponder on for Taiwanese video and photographic artists in the following years, especially the potential driving force of anti-spectacle, which seems to run parallel with the strong politics of Taiwanese government on these two spectacles of urban renewal and education competition with many different dialectical relationships interweaving densely between these two spectacles.

In terms of contemporary Taiwan art phenomenon in 2010, a "stable" state did appear on the surface. Occurring with comparison to global economic austerity and threat of U.S. monetary policy, this kind of "stability", such as continuous art exhibitions, reproduction of exhibition themes, market offer, standardized forms of works and exhibitions, are all the "spectacle-style" productions. These superficial "productions" are in fact not the gradual specification of art development, the active interaction between art and society or the normalization of market mechanism, but that the labor force of art enters cities and capital and power allocation relationship of society more quickly. The Hollywood spectacle as traditional culture industry has already treated to the back line, but the generally recognized "difference" has no need to fight against any "identity spectacles", because identity spectacle is no longer the spectacle of representation symbols, but the reflexivity spectacle of the gradually identified production relations. On the one hand, it is the tremendous external institutionalization, on the other hand, it is the unceasingly deepening "biopolitics": the creations and exhibitions of Taiwan artists are more like the "matrix" spectacle which is completed by a naked person with excessive work.

"Video", an art category which is more and more difficult to define, is undoubtedly the most sensitive field in which reflexivity implants the deepest, because the democracy in the price of digital equipment, the acceleration in network transmission and flexibility in exhibitions enable the pondering on video images to separate from the impersonal state between "self-poeticness" and "art per se", and polarize into individual thinking at both ends of "self-poeticness" and "deployment location". The former protects the fragile subject expression with delicate knowledge and information, while the latter will internalize itself into operating unit and enter the

utility-oriented struggle field, genuinely become the “database animal” called by Azuma Hiroki. “Database animal” is almost the typical “post-mankind” of “reflexivity” after globalization.

Other than steadily producing list of works with high quality, this personification type in the contemporary video creation of Taiwan make people disappointed to see “art = reproduction”, even the “reproduction” becomes the “stability” which is expected by many anxious insiders. Creative implication of productiveness fades away quickly in the superficial commercial mechanisms and the quick realization of administrative bureaucracy’s promises. Relative to the art creation of reproduction and stabilization—by which normalization of social links is also destined, two different trends in video arts are reversely inspired, fictional legend and machine behavior. Mainly with “pseudo-documentary” or “parodied consumption image”, “fictional legend” makes daily life close to individuality and environment take on a feeling of heterogeneity, and a creative reproduction escaping from modernism framework of symbols and allegories and organized capitalism framework, such as Wu Chi-yu’s *Linkou Monsters* and *Cockroach House* which “featurize” daily life, Kao Ya-ting’s *A Thousand Years* which elfizes one hundred years of sate founding and Lin Guan-ming’s *For Years and Years*. “Machine behavior” no longer takes machine as hidden text of image reproduction, nor sees machine as metaphor of media criticism, but to plan a linkage scheme of machine and creation activities, which not only strides over McLuhan’s identity of media and body and interactive metaphor, but also differs from the initial media Apriorism trend in system theory. It is the “behavior-video” which collocates machine-refusing body autonomy and machine-obsessing integralization, such as Su Yu-hsein’s interactive video sketches, *Sketch from Chatroulette*, Chiang Chung-lun’s *Mercury Man* and Zhong Ting’s *Passion Killer of Flash Tragedy*, etc, which builds the parody of commerce and media operations into papers’ oral-examination mechanism in art education system, transforming confrontation of discussion into makeup performance and behavior interaction.

In fact, there still exists the third image operation with the lowest proportion, which is not the parodied mini-irony but cutting critically into production situation of young artists in globalization with “interpretation” and “transposition”, such as Jao Chia-En’s *Statement* and Yu Cheng-ta’s teaching videos. Although these three directions are several developments highlighted by young contemporary Taiwan artists, they cannot be simply summed up as “style” or “theme” of young Taiwan artists, because we can see Chen Chieh-jen’s “shrewdness” to jump over “interestingness” in all these three directions at the same time and push to the border of politics and history in *Empire’s Borders II*, in other words, jumping over the

ambiguous state between mediatized material and materialized media, although this is a very real dilemma, and statement challenging the “position”, trying hard to escape from the thorough and comprehensive “relativity”: because what the “relativity” can express at best is art elites’ practice of knowledge. It dissolves impersonal mini revolutionary force with extremely abstract, speculative and impersonal position, and in the meantime, this constantly shifting “relativity” is the weapon with which cultural bureaucracy and non-organized capitalism is sufficient to incorporate various forces. This is a necessary historic moment to cut in and contemplate the image behavior which is generated from the interweaving and dynamics of mini sensibility: a necessary moment to escape from “relativity”. This moment marks that contemporary art no longer possesses any representative position in society to oppose or resist ideologically the system. This is not only because the system absorbs quickly personal creativity and opinions, but also because each person is not just a free individual and each subject of reflexivity is the nation, the system and even the “company”. This reflexivity has become an internal homogeneous “life management” and has canceled “reflection” which is expected by modernism theorists. After all, “reflection” is turned into “performance” and “record” in both specialized field and evaluation mechanism. And whether it is “fictional legend”, “machine behavior” or “interpretation translocation”, it is attempting to escape from the established form and legal relationship between video and body and daily life, namely, to “perform” and “record”.

In response to shifting condition transformations, other than the above creation opportunities, the contemporary art of Taiwan, which highly depends on academies, will face the challenge of a strange and paradoxical “reverse society” in the near future. This operation is indeed a breakthrough in contemporary art’s weakness and ineffectiveness of discussing social issue, because in a large number of works and Biennial exhibitions, social issues are just a part of spectacle, and even are taken as complementary items of daily life. However, the strengthening of reflexivity cannot complete a unique internality of social links as Deleuze’s imagination—in fact, he clearly opposes reflexivity. The unique visions it brought to young people are just more narrow allocation of social space and distribution of unpaid labor, instead it drives internality out of homogenous internality in a fuller scale. In short, this “reversing society” is very likely to remove creative power of unique internality and particularity of social issues.

### **Media Spectacle and Materialized Reality**

Digital and network technology enables messages to pass with high speed of current, causing the speed of reproduction greatly exceeding the conditions required

in forming productiveness. This “reproduction”, which gradually abolishes productive force and productiveness, --endless image-imitating—is to mediatize art creation and tempt all the media by giving materialized new productive force. Whether Chen Chieh-jen, Yao Jui-chung and Wang Jun-jieh’s who criticize and question spectacle, Su Yu-hsein, Wu Chi-yu and Chiang Chung-lun who maximize mini subjectivity with institutionalized mode of production and complete the experience from spectacle self-deprecating to ironic spectacle, or Jao Chia-En and Yu Cheng-ta who operate delicately the link of sensitivity and criticism and challenge the internal subtle logic of spectacle, we can see that they are well aware of the “Global culture industry” created by this informatization and cyberization. It is also because that this global culture industry replaces continuously the subjectivity of “man” with the subjectivity of “material-media” through constant consumer behavior which “fluidizes” spectacle itself and enables the “performance action” of situationism to become as identical as spectacle itself in fluidized spectacle.

In the early development of Taiwan contemporary art in the 21st century, we notice clearly that under the situation of global culture industry, “reality” itself is in a comprehensive and thoroughly process of “materialization”. Whether it is the object of materialization or the simplified environment by it, reality is the absent material itself, and the “cognitive material” which is created continuously by society to replace the material itself. “Reality” continues to split because of different situations, in the meantime, “reality” materializes quickly through art creation and exhibition because of globalization. The former is the fragmentation of world history and the latter is the “dehistoricization” of super history. In short, reality cannot be kept out of “materialization” in the thoughts of intellectuals and artists, but today reality is materialized as exhibits and commodities in a more comprehensive and single way.

Artists are negative derivatives of reality and rarely are anonymous in community as identity of reality. But because of the drastic change of survival and economic conditions, crisis has merged in reality itself. With the diversity of individuality, reality continues to split and the progress of art critique joins at the moment. Meanwhile, under the effect of general anxiety of social groups and the existing power relations, this problem, in the pursuit of modernity, is dissimilated “semi-voluntarily” as the demand that art must respond to and feed back reality. Under the demand, the Taipei Biennial of 2010-2011 and the Flower Expo overlap in exhibiting period “coincidentally” to a considerable extent. From these two exhibitions of different natures—the former emphasizes that art, as a reality of differentiation, is a re-interpretation of art and the latter is the exhibition of life aesthetics demonstrating Taiwan’s cultural taste and emphasizing the aesthetic education needed and understandable in Taiwan society—we can see that citizens are

not encouraged to have more positive imagination on reality or more concern about the relationship between vulgar sense of beauty and reality because of these two exhibitions. On the contrary, through the development from 2008 to 2010, we see that the form of “political art” has increasingly become a tool for young artists to operate and consume “reality”. This is what the above commentators try to mark out: through the development of contemporary Taiwan art, reality is being rapidly “materialized” by several fixed modes. Because today’s “reality” can gain considerable exposure on the stage of contemporary art ; in short, materialization of reality makes video creation in Taiwan approach continuously the “joyous” and “interesting” media spectacles, or political art and art politics are both transformed into media spectacles through image and video in the production relations. The “general and rapid materialization of reality” is undoubtedly a crisis which dissolves potential significance of reality. Accompanied by this crisis, only individual reality other than structural reality can be seen in Taiwan. The structural reality is structurally hidden and what both the congestive state of individual reality and the depression state of structural reality erase and suppress is “individuality—reality”.

### **From Film to Video**

From 2008 to 2011, contemporary Taiwan video art has begun its process of diversification. In this, what act as a catalyst is that the intervention of social orientation and political issue enables video art which focuses on image texture and poetic romance to have more extended ways. In fact, the influence of anti-globalization and post-colonial issues on Taiwan video art creation is not as the total and unconditional acceptance or swallowing theories without understanding as before. Other than direct links to a handful of video artists, the new trend of contemporary European art has influenced Taiwan video creation negatively at that time. Prior to this, between 2002 and 2006, Yuan Goang-ming’s poetic videos about illusions of motion and time, Chen Chieh-jen’s Factory series and Wang Jun-jieh’s Microbiology Association are all extremely important video works. Yuan Goang-ming focuses on poetic reproduction of purified motion and time in images, and the latter two, through high-density images, mainly present criticism on historic writing and consumer society respectively. Later, Tsui Kuang-yu opened a new body awareness and thus derive another possibility for Taiwan behavioral video. Obviously, we can say that Taiwan video is gradually escaping from critical emotional images. Whether images of Yuan Goang-ming, Chen Cheih-jen or Wang Jun-jieh, they all possess a requirement of “mediation distance” because of profundity of creation themes and form of projection devices. And Tsui Kuang-yu’s images hang in the balance between projector and TV screen. He creates a “distance” between body and

language through ignorant body's silent act in reality field in which the perception process is extremely rapid, therefore, no fixed thinking distance is needed. We can even say that a great percentage of Chen Chieh-jen, Wang Jun-jieh and Yuan Goang-ming's image conceptions come from the experience of film images which also become a metaphoric form for them to fight against capitalist consumption era. But Tsui Kuang-yu began to present the video creation which is closer to TV image experience, what he attaches importance to is the visual vibration presented by the "distance" between watching habit and minimal deviation.

From 2004 to 2008 saw important video artists, Tseng Yu-chin, Wang Ya-hui and Wu Chi-tsung. The development contexts and temperaments of the three artists vary, but invariably they created peculiar perceptual situations through "man" and "material". Tseng Yu-chin is adept in transforming object's emotional state and texture through guidance of movement and performance; Wang Ya-hui often creates unique story with the state of spatial variation; and Wu Chi-tsung's creation form is to create artistic conception with camera equipment. The former two—they have tried to shoot experimental films in early period—specialize in transforming from projectable film images to expressive images of implicit narrative, while Wu Chi-tsung has purified in a higher degree the relationship between material, technology and reproduced fantasy. Obviously, the layer-style development from 2002 to 2008 is a superposition of film language and its transfer to the two video explorations of image of implicit narrative image and media image. During the transforming process, creative individuals are revealed as social individuals through films by Chen Cheih-jen and Wang Jun-jieh, it is a symbolized reproduction of individual through images. This symbolization is the method for individual to establish links with society. In contrast, Tsui Kuang-yu is a poet of media image, the individual in it is expressed as life character and what accompanies is the boundary exploration on the reproduction technique. Tsui Kuang-yu is Taiwan video's early record of individual performance behavior. Different from the early Tehching Hsieh, Li Ming-sheng or Xi Rang, his body does not reproduce the engraved memory, nor the body of fighting against others, but a body fighting against itself through games. Therefore, his video has no history, only the logic-short-circuit-oriented games. Tseng Yu-chin and Wang Ya-hui transform emotional scenes of implicit narrative to the interpretation of inner world, but because of its uniqueness of inner emotion, Tseng Yu-chin has created a composite emotion of taboo and injury and Wang Ya-hui has continuously presented the leaps which "open another world".

### **Visualization and Mediazation**

Young artists have broken free from the burden of reproduction borne by new

realism images through digital technology and turn to face the individual life which isolates from society through development of individualism, trying subjectively to declare the existing moments of itself by making reality mutate. This cognition and practice are indeed in the same way to make certain “subjectization”, but it is still difficult to produce the network politics expected by Manuel Castells. Its key lies in that the use of network is fully constrained within the framework of consumption which is set by consumption system. The self-declaration is simply based on the operation pleasure of subject image, and new symbiotic communities, which are unable to self-create, makes subjectization become a political behavior calling for strategic recognition. Thus, on the contrary, a politicality of “anti-political aspiration” appeared after 2008. Excessive kitsch became these artists’ wager to resist the old ideological struggle and consumer culture. However, Taiwan’s kitsch system with populist operation tendency, on the one hand, makes overtures to such art routes, and on the other hand, attempts to declare a new identity of globalized market—namely, cultural and creative industry “occupies” deployment power. Undoubtedly, what cultural and creative industry declares is a demand on “new output value” and “new revenue” in digital industry era. Here, a difficult problem which faces today’s young artists emerges: the struggle between reproduction logic and difference logic. As a phenomenon of commercial development, cultural and creative industry avoids drawbacks of capital monopoly through cultural difference mainly in terms of “micro-difference” of sensitivity and “fragmentization” and “discretization” of revenue. But when cultural and creative industry becomes the new product of global competition today, “cultural and creative products” are just another kind of public commodities in which sensibility can only make reproduction of “subtle difference” rather than the unique sensibility of itself as micro-difference. Therefore, there exists a paradox of democratic deliberation: “I am the reproduction”, such an ontological problem. Under the operation of bureaucratic policies, art museum also becomes the immediate legitimacy endowed to the ontological problem (also the problem of subjectization)—namely, differentiating “naturalization”, nature is the difference. In fact, in the state of inability to declare new symbiosis and new identity, the reproduction-style power struggle and ethical order is inherited when all necessity of thought and politics is emptied. In this way, creativity of image enters quietly the ethical framework of “substitute work”; under an administrative mechanism without confidence and endeavor, art museum gives up gradually to establish the position of voicing field and merchandizes itself under the guidance of policies and becomes the importer of globalization discourses. In this rough review of new production relations, it seems that one can imagine: rule is always quicker to grasp the timing which takes reproduction as identity basis, while the political action which breaks this

kind of reproduction of power is unable to dominate images and misses the opportunity to create image-event because of ethical framework.

Under such a mechanism which combines commerce and politics, from 2009 to 2011, two kinds of video artists with different gestures have been generated. One kind is that the visualized gesture of indifference and criticism isolates completely from media environment with “inner poeticness”, such as Lin Guan-ming and Lin Jin-da, or adopting critic and skeptic attitude on mediazation and sensory consumption, such as Jao Chia-en, Chou Yu-cheng and Hsu Chian-yu. Another kind is the mediazed gesture of pleasure and implosion, on the one hand, it challenges quickly self-mediazation, such as Su Hui-yu, Yu Cheng-ta, Su Yu-hsien, Hsieh Muchi, Wu Chi-yu, Huang Yen-ying, Ni Xiang, Fuxinghen Studio and Wonder Boys, on the other hand, it is the digital behavior of Aristotle-style imitation, such as Chiang Chung-lun and Su Yu-hsien. The artists situated between the two gestures are Yu Cheng-ta, Hsu Chian-yu, Wu Chi-yu and Ni Xiang. Judging from the works of Lin Guan-ming and Lin Jin-da, for them, film images are no longer image’s special perspective and composition, but images in media memory; but they have the image scales as in the works of Yuan Goang-ming, Chen Chieh-jen and Wang Jun-Jieh, the difference is that, for them, the scale is from experience of space projection. Jao Chia-en and Chou Yu-cheng are a kind of close-range distance image, that is, the distance between TV and video. Their creative thinking touches media, but the creation content is deconstructing the inner logic of media, and Hsu Chian-yu views images directly as media to use, but he tries to produce resistance-style reflection images. Obviously, self-mediazed artists have become more and more in today’s Taiwan. That is a political aspiration which can not only get rid of the old, but also satisfy properly individual pleasure, but it is complete relativism under a lighter speculation; In the production and presentation of its images, the main concern is no longer the problems of texture and distance, but speed and senses; As for digital behavior, it mainly refers to the network interface-based interaction and circulation between behavior and image and the emphasis of images lies in privacy and real time. Thus, the images produced by mediazed gesture are mainly micro images which resort to senses, speed, privacy and real time.

From such a process, individual in today Taiwanese today is polarized into two kinds of political selections. One is stressing the urgency of political confrontation; the other is getting rid of all the social labels and responsibilities and stressing how to release from political life. But invariably they are more distinct “individualization”. Because even participating in social activities, they no longer determine position through symbolization, but reproduce “multitude” samples or group portraits which are closely related to individual experience and behavior; However, the reason why



privatization and real time orientation can be mastered as creative thinking by creative individuals is also because network interface provides presentation and circulation that on longer strengthen mediating images but visual information images which can be quickly identified and gain allegorical pleasure with relativity.

Individuals can grasp film's shooting and production, individualization of image creating experience is the beginning of "video". For most video artists who matured in the early twentieth century, the "watch" experience came from film; through this conceptualized and symbolized "watch", individuals could present himself or herself with various abstracting reproductions. When film and television becomes images in living environment, images become language and also become environment; individuals usually respond to the media world with mysterious and fantastic inner or more reasonable and objective thinking. But when digits and network dissociate and reorganize the media environment quickly, individuals seem to follow through their own dissociation and reorganization which are "parallel input and output" and "mediated excessiveness" in the expression of creative individuals.

In the end of the article, allow me to make a terse description on an ad hoc basis in order to summary the above discussion more clearly: if Taiwan's video development is roughly divided into three phases, the first phase is the development of experimental images (70s-80s), mostly the dialectical relationship of Taiwan art was developed through simulation of experimental image form; the development of the second phase (late 1990s) is that under the leadership and promotion of art museums and Biennale, the creation of professional images responded to two orientations of aesthetics and politics while reflected on projection space; The characteristic of the third phase (21st century) is the mutual penetration of consumption experience and art thinking, as a communication and public medium, images are the poetic close-up of individual experience on the one hand, and the straightforward dialogue with environment on the other hand. Although strictly speaking, the three phases cross thirty years, the first phase in fact does not have clear continuity, and the time span of the latter two phases is only more than ten years. Therefore, the video artists who developed in the latter two phases need to face the raising problems and the remained traces of another phase at the same time, and in which the inner tension between the artists is tremendous. All in all, images are no longer the objects to be watched or the projection plane, because of the separation among body, place and time, or the cross junction of the three through more laminated way, the necessity of images begins to differentiate. One the one hand, the projection itself no longer intends to create neutral image space, and on the other hand, the emergence of images becomes community events. The first phase is decontextualizing relevant European and American images and attempting to intervene transcendently

in Taiwanese art context, the second phase is entering the international era of multi-cultures and culture translation and the third phase is the time to re-establish relations with capitalism and launch fights against capitalism.

Through another standpoint, we even can say that contemporary Taiwan video is the movement of “micro-video”. In first phase, as the movement of marginal minority, videos are small images with rich art colors and strong social demands, but the main video content does not respond directly to political and social issues; In the second phase, by connecting individual emotional experience, historical texture and international issues, videos presentation reach the level of international exhibitions, and from form to meaning, image content and expression begin to make possible international dialogues. In the third phase, creative intentions concentrate more and more on relevant issues of contemporary art, most video artists jump over these issues through individual poeticness and few can continue and develop the research route. But the internationalization (globalization) of this time has already moved away from content and dialogue, and concentrating on the operating surface to a considerable extent, system exchange has replaced the dialogue of art content.