



---

# **Exhibition Reviews Annual 2014–15**

---

**A selection of the best entries from the  
first International Awards for Art Criticism**

**Jury Members**

JJ Charlesworth, Carol Lu, Karen Smith,  
Richard Vine, Rachel Withers, with Yi Ying

## Animism: Curating Discourse

*Animism*, Ilmin Museum, Seoul,  
6 December 2013 – 2 March 2014

Although theories such as object-oriented ontology, speculative realism, and vital materiality have recently made their way into the art world as direct references – even appearing in a review of the 2014 Whitney Biennial for *Artforum*, and as a rationale behind Carolyn Christov-Bakargiev's vision for documenta 13 (2014) – several artists and curators have been working with these ideas for at least the past five years.

*Animism*, an ongoing exhibition and publication project curated by Berlin-based curator Anselm Franke, is one of the first to incorporate these theories. The exhibition premiered at Extra City and M HKA, Antwerp, in 2010 and since then has travelled to Kunsthalle Bern (2010), Generali Foundation in Vienna (2011), Haus der Kulturen der Welt in Berlin (2012), e-flux in New York (2012), OCAT in Shenzhen (2013), Ilmin Museum in Seoul (2013/14) and Ashkal Alwan Home Workspace in Beirut (2014). The show in Berlin was accompanied by a conference that included lectures by Graham Harman and Quentin Meillassoux on correlationism, speculative materialism and object-oriented ontology as examples of emerging theories that critique modernity's imposed separations between nature and culture, subjects and objects, external world and inner thoughts.

The exhibition itself featured over thirty artists (the list grows a bit with each subsequent version) whose works 'reflect on the boundary between subjects and objects and the modern anxiety that accompanies the relation between 'persons' and 'things'.<sup>1</sup> Mostly film and installation works by a diverse group of artists – including Marcel Broodthaers, Len Lye, Ken Jacobs, Harun Farocki, Candida Höfer, and Ana Mandieta – were shown alongside archival material, creating a complex narrative of disparate references. The combination of contemporary art and ethnographic artifacts acts as evidence of modernity's many contradictions. In a review of the Shenzhen exhibition for *Leap*, Pu Hong refers to the exhibition as a 'quintessential product' of modernist thinking, with its cycle of anxiety and ensuing crisis.<sup>2</sup> Perhaps what he means is that if it weren't for modernity's conflicted colonialist foundations, we wouldn't be looking at such a fractured narrative.

Several works in the exhibition explore objectification, specifically within the museum setting, such as the film *Les statues meurent aussi* (1953) by Chris Marker and Alain Resnais, which traces the colonial appropriation of African artifacts both in ethnographic museums and commercial tourism. Some works such as León Ferrari's subversive collage series *L'Osservatore Romano* (2001-7), focuses on the harsh boundaries established by Western culture (specifically the Roman Catholic church) through the domination of other cultures, while Yayoi Kusama's film *Kusama's Self-Obliteration* (1967) documents the artist relinquishing her own bodily boundaries to become part of the broader world around her. Other artists explore interactions between humans and things that seem all too animate, such as Daria Martin's film *Soft Materials* (2004), which shows human dancers and a robot performing an intimate choreography in an artificial intelligence laboratory, and Walon Green's film adaptation of *The Secret Life of Plant* (1979), which uses time-lapse both to 'animate plants' for the human eye and to slow human life down to what we can entertain as a 'plant's perspective'. Agency's installation for the exhibition assembles a list of things that defy the binary oppositions of nature/culture and human/non-human to show that these boundaries are not as steadfast as they seem. This range of perspectives reveals that animism cannot be pinned down as one might an exotic specimen for study; it is a colonialist term with a fraught history, but one that can be reclaimed, and whose subject matter – the more reciprocal or spiritual relations between the human and non-human world – has ceased to be stamped out.

These fractures within modernity's foundations that Franke references within the exhibition are what have led so many artists to investigate the relationships between nature and culture, people and things. Western image culture is at once ripe with commodity fetishes and inhabited by objects that are supposedly devoid of enchantment. Not every artist who works with this subject matter was featured in *Animism*. Several artists – video artist Shana Moulton and robotics and performance artist Paula Gaetano-Adi in the US, and conceptual designers Dunne and Raby and Auger-Loizeau in the UK, to name a few – have all been making work that imagines new, often anti-hierarchical, configurations of people and things (and things and things) long before the exhibition premiered in Antwerp.

These interrogations, regardless of the form they take, approach what sociologist and anthropologist Bruno Latour calls 'the field of nonmodern worlds'.<sup>3</sup> Latour uses the term 'nonmodern' to suggest that

modernism itself, along with the 'disenchant[ment]' of the world, never truly took hold. 'Our own mythology consists in imagining ourselves as radically different',<sup>5</sup> Latour asserts, and this is where the difficulty arises, not from having agencies that appear strikingly similar to spirits of animist societies, but from having such agencies and simultaneously denying their existence. It is important to note that the ideologies that stem from this confrontation with the modern are not simply romanticisations or fetishisations of the premodern, but develop from a long-needed critique from within of how Western civilisation has used notions of animism and primitivism to construct a linear hierarchy between Western and non-western cultures.

One way of approaching this broader field of the nonmodern is to reflect critically on the historical construction of 'modern' civilisation in opposition to 'primitive' societies. In an interview between Franke and Latour for *Animism Volume 1*, the exhibition catalog (which doubles as a densely packed textbook) for the first exhibition at M HKA, Antwerp, Latour poses the following queries to propose how modern – declaredly non-animist – societies have fallen into contradiction in light of recognising their own animist mechanisms.

Suddenly, the Europeans realised that, wait a minute, maybe we made a big mistake in attributing animism to others. What happens if we have been animists, and in what way were we? Since we have agencies everywhere, we mix the agencies, we made a whole series of transformation about the agent, we added wings, and we took the souls out, and sometimes the opposite. We did all sorts of very, very strange things, and we turned to the others, who are no longer, others, and what did they do? Well they modernised without any worry.<sup>6</sup>

Using the exhibition as a platform, Franke seeks to redefine the word animism, coined by 19<sup>th</sup>-century anthropologist Edward Tylor to classify 'primitive' societies, and apply it to what Latour calls 'modernity's image culture' which fuels 'an aesthetic economy' of products crafted to communicate desire.<sup>7</sup> Through each iteration of the exhibition and corresponding compendium of essays, *Animism* prods at the border established when 'modern' civilisation declared so-called animist societies as *other* and used this negation to construct its own identity and presumed superiority.

Referred to as 'master of the essay-exhibition', Franke is above all a curator of discourse; he uses the exhibition format to bring issues from post-colonialism, science, ecology, ethics and politics into focus within the realm of visual arts and cultural production.<sup>8</sup> Both *Animism* and his most recent exhibition *The Anthropocene Project*, which opened on 16 October

2014 at Haus der Kulturen der Welt, Berlin, tackle subjects beyond the cultural sphere.

Though *Animism* marks the first considerably large-scale international exhibition to apply the term animism within contemporary Western art, Franke's goal is to mobilise the 'aesthetics and politics of animism, and their significance for reaching beyond the West/Non-West binary today.'<sup>9</sup> For this reason, the exhibition's journey beyond the confines of Europe and the US has been particularly important, and yielded increasingly rich exhibitions. In her review of the OCAT exhibition, Aimee Lin writes:

*Animism* as an exhibition does not simply rethink colonialism at the political, economic and psychological level, but also questions the colonialism that appears anywhere, at any time, in human thought and knowledge systems... by touring around the world, the show itself is practicing a kind of intervention... at an atomic scale.<sup>10</sup>

Each time *Animism* is presented, the exhibition undergoes flux in relation to the history of its host location. For example, the exhibition in Seoul co-organised by Franke and the Ilmin Museum of Art featured 'documents, images, videos and installations examining Korean shamanism' from the Museum's archive that were displayed in addition to the works featured in previous exhibitions. According to Lee Woo-young, a writer for the *Korean Herald*, the inclusion of these artifacts was a way for the museum to address 'shamanistic practices' that government-initiated campaigns of the 1970s had 'stamped out in [Korea's] shift to industrialisation and modernisation.'<sup>11</sup> The exhibition also featured recent work by several Korean artists exploring related themes, adding new perspectives to the exhibition's purposefully complex narrative. At the press opening for the exhibition, Franke spoke of the exhibition as a pursuit against 'the division between tradition and modernity' and the negative effects such sharp divisions have had on social conditions.<sup>12</sup> The exhibition in Seoul is interesting in that it continues the discourse from previous exhibitions while paying particular attention to how these ideas that Franke wishes to draw attention to – the construction of modernism in opposition to non-Western cultural traditions and spiritualities – has shaped the current culture and history of Seoul.

Though the exhibition has now spread to eight different locales – São Paulo is next – its only US presence has been at e-flux's exhibition space in New York (2012). While e-flux is an apt home for the

exhibition due to the critical discourse the organisation bolsters with *e-flux journal*, I wonder how it might have manifested itself at a larger, more mainstream institution such as New York's Museum of Modern Art. There is still much critical work to be done in the US on the subject of anti-hierarchical theories of objects, and for this reason I wonder if the exhibition's lack of exposure in the US is both a product of and evidence to this lag.

Though more oblique and less overtly critical in its approach, in 2011 MoMA hosted an exhibition titled *Talk to Me: Design and the Communication between People and Objects*, which featured the work of over 300 designers who aim to make the inanimate world more communicable through integrating new interactive technologies into consumer products. Though they share the common thread of enlivened objects, the MoMA exhibition took on an air that is more commercial, more human-centric, and less critical – though many of the artists and designers featured in the exhibition make heavily critical work. In a statement for the exhibition, curator Paola Antonelli claims that

whether openly and actively or in subtle, subliminal ways, things talk to us. Objects and systems that were once charged only with being elegant and functional now have personalities and have become communicative, making our world newly interactive.<sup>13</sup>

Though Antonelli's statement refers to a recent communicable turn, the wealth of writing on evocative and talkative objects denotes instead a gradual chipping away at levels of interactivity and communicability already present in objects, or at least perceived to be present in such, rather than a dramatic shift. What is most interesting to me, then, is what makes these qualities so apparent now. What does a mass consumer desire for objects that are more obviously interactive rather than subtly or symbolically interactive signal about the state of the modern subject, of the capitalist consumer? Perhaps in line with Latour in his interview with Franke referenced earlier, I wonder if perhaps the modern subject of Western civilisation – unavoidably a consumer – has begun to pine for a version of the enchantment modernity denies, and has come to invest the object with the *spirit* of technology, to animate the consumer world in a way that passes under the radar due to its shiny technological facade.

Recently in the US, advertisements have been posted prominently at elevated train stops urging people not to risk their lives by climbing down onto the tracks to retrieve dropped smart phones.

Shopping centres boast advertisements for digital cameras that say things like "Travel with me, I never forget a face" and public service announcements depicting disposable plastic water bottles with the text 'I want to be a pair of jeans, recycle me!' grace bus terminals. In this modern age, it is becoming increasingly difficult to explain our affinities for things in a purely logical manner. Modernity has removed the souls from things so that capitalism can sell them back to us. We are already embedded within an object continuum, but simply lack clear, linguistic representations for addressing it.

Exhibitions like *Animism* help us parse out these contradictions, and to place their origin within Western modernity itself. As the exhibition grows with each venue, and more theories, voices, visions and speculations are added to the array, the possibility to speculate alternatives increases at an exponential rate. As evidenced from Franke's current *Anthropocene Project*, which stems from many of the same theories evoked in *Animism*, sometimes looking back also leads to moving forward.

- 1 Anselm Franke, *Animism Volume 1*, Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2010, back cover.
- 2 Pu Hong, 'Animism', Review of *Animism*, OCT Contemporary Art Terminal, Shenzhen, *Leap International Art Magazine of Contemporary China*, 2014.
- 3 Bruno Latour, *We Have Never Been Modern*, trans. Catherine Porter, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991, p. 48.
- 4 Latour, *We Have Never Been Modern*, p. 114.
- 5 Latour, *We Have Never Been Modern*, p. 116.
- 6 Bruno Latour, 'Angels Without Wings: A conversation between Bruno Latour and Anselm Franke', *Animism Volume 1*, ed. Anselm Franke, Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2010, p. 92.
- 7 Latour, 'Angels Without Wings: A conversation between Bruno Latour and Anselm Franke', p. 13.
- 8 'Power 100: Anselm Franke', *ArtReview*, 2013.
- 9 'Animism: Drawing the Line', exhibition announcement for *Animism*, OCT Contemporary Art Terminal, Shenzhen, *Parasite*, 2013.
- 10 Aimee Lin, 'Animism', Review of *Animism*, OCT Contemporary Art Terminal, Shenzhen, *ArtReview Asia*, 2013.
- 11 Lee Woo-young, 'Ancient Beliefs Spirited Away in the Shift to Modernity', *Korean Herald*, 2013.
- 12 Woo-young, 'Ancient Beliefs Spirited Away in the Shift to Modernity'.
- 13 Paola Antonelli, *Talk to Me: Design and Communication between People and Objects*, New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2011, back cover description.

## 万物有灵：策展的话语

《万物有灵》，首尔焕基美术馆，2013.12.6 - 2014.3.2

虽然以客体为导向的本体论 (object-oriented ontology)、推知实在论 (speculative-realism) 以及重要物质性 (vital materiality) 等理论最近成为了艺术界的直接参考——甚至出现在了《艺术论坛 (Artforum)》对2014年惠特尼双年展 (Whitney Biennial) 的艺评中，但在Carolyn Christov-Bakargiev对于第13届文献展的想法背后——几位艺术家和策展人带着这些理念工作了至少五年。

“万物有灵”，一个正在进行的展览和出版项目，由生活、工作在柏林的策展人Anselm Franke主持，是最早吸收这些理论的展览之一。2010年该展览首度于安特卫普的Extra City和MuHKA展出，之后又巡展到：伯尔尼Kunsthalle Bern (2010年)；维也纳Generali基金会 (2011年)；柏林Haus der Kulturen der Welt (HKW) (2012年)；纽约E-Flux (2012年)；深圳OCAT (2013年)；首尔Ilmin艺术博物馆 (2013/14年) 以及贝鲁特Ashkal Alwan家庭工作室 (2014年)。在柏林HKW举办的展览还召开了学术会议，会上Graham Harman和Quentin Meillassoux以相关论 (correlationism)、推知实在论 (speculative realism) 及以客体为导向的本体论 (object-oriented ontology) 为例，做了关于新兴理论的讲座，这些理论评论了现代性加诸于自然与文化、主体和客体、外部世界和内部思维之上的分离。

展览本身展出了三十多位艺术家的作品 (后续的巡展每次都会增加几位)，这些作品“反映了主体和客体之间的界限以及伴随着‘人’与‘物’的关系产生的现代焦虑。”<sup>1</sup> 由不同艺术家——包括Marcel Broodthaers、Len Lye、Ken Jacobs、Harun Farocki、Candida Hufer及Ana Mandieta——创作的电影和装置作品伴随着档案材料一同展出，营造出一种对不同参考资料的复杂叙述。当代艺术与人种志展品的混合，成为了现代性中很多矛盾的佐证。在《艺术界 (Leap)》杂志对深圳展览的一篇艺评中，蒲鸿写道，展览表现了焦虑感和危机感是现代主义思想的“典型产物”<sup>2</sup>。也许他想表达的是如果不是因为现代性的殖民主义基础，我们不会看到这样破碎的叙述。

展览中的几个作品探索了物化/客体化这个问题，尤其是在博物馆环境中，如Chris Marker及Alain Resnais的电影《雕像也死去了 (Les statues meurent aussi)》(1953年)，追溯了在入种博物馆和商业旅游中对非洲手工制品的殖民占有。一些作品如León Ferrari颠覆性的拼贴画系列“罗马观察家报 (L' Osservatore Romano)” (2001-07年)，关注了西方文化 (特别是罗马天主教会) 通过统治其他文化建立的严格界限，草间弥生的电影《草间弥生的自我消解》(1967年) 记录了艺术家放弃了自己身体的界限而成为周围更广阔世界的一部分。其他艺术家探索了人类与物品之间的关系似乎过于亲密，例如Daria Martin的电影《柔软材料 (Soft

Materials)》(2004年)，表现了人类舞者和机器人在人工智能实验室中表演亲密舞蹈；Walon Green的电影《植物的秘密生活 (The Secret Life of Plant)》(1979年) 用微速摄影使“植物”在人类眼中更“生动”，也使我们可以从“植物的视角”来看慢下来的人类生活。展览中的装置作品集合了一系列反对自然/文化以及人/非人之间对立的事物。这一系列观点说明万物有灵论已经不能被认为是另类的研究议题；它是一个有历史的殖民主义术语，但可被重新使用，其主题——人与非人世界间互相联系或精神性的关系——也已不再被抵制。

Franke在展览中所引用的这些现代性基础中的碎片指引许多艺术家研究自然与文化及人与事物的关系。西方形象的文化是伴随着对商品的迷恋而迅速成熟的，但却充斥着毫无魅力的事物。致力于表现这一主题的艺术家们有些没有在“万物有灵”展中展出。几个艺术家——如美国影像艺术家Shana Moulton、机器人及行为艺术家Paula Gaetano-Adi、英国概念设计师Dunne & Raby及Auger-Loizeau等——都在创作想像新的，通常是去阶级化的人与事物的配置 (和事物与事物间的配置)，其创作的时间远远早于安特卫普的首展。

这些诘问无论以何种方式发出，都接近与社会学家兼人类学家Bruno Latour所称的“非现代世界的领域”<sup>3</sup>。Latour使用了术语“非现代”来暗示现代主义自身和世界的“祛魅”从未真正产生影响<sup>4</sup>。他认为“我们自身的神话包括把自己想像得迥然不同”<sup>5</sup>，并且难解之处正在于此，而非在于拥有这样的执行者并同时否认他们的存在。注意到来自与现代的对抗的这种意识形态并不仅仅是对前现代 (premodern) 的浪漫化或恋物化，而是因为长期以来需要对于西方文明怎样用万物有灵论和原始论构建了西方和非西方文化间的线性等级作出评论。

接近非现代的广大领域的一种途径是批判性地反思与“原始”社会相对的“现代”文明有怎样的历史建构。在安特卫普MuHKA首展的展览目录《万物有灵 (卷1)》里Franke和Bruno Latour的一次访谈中，Latour用以下疑问指出：由于认识到其自身的万物有灵机制，现代——宣称万物非有灵——社会已经落入了矛盾之中。

忽然之间，欧洲人意识到：等等，也许我们在将万物有灵论归因于其他的时候，已经犯下错误。如果我们一直都是万物有灵主义会怎样呢？我们究竟是怎样的万物有灵主义者呢？既然到处都有我们的执行者，我们将执行者混合在一起，让这种执行者作出了一系列的转变，加上翅膀，去除灵魂，有时又反过来。我们做了所有这些非常怪异的事情，而后再转投他方，转向那些已经不是其他人的他人，而我们又做了什么？他们毫无任何忧虑地现代化了<sup>6</sup>。

以展览为平台，Franke试图重新定义“万物有灵论”这个由19世纪人类学家爱德华·泰勒提出用于对“原始”社会进行分类的术语，并将其应用于Latour称为“现代性的形象文化”，这种文化激起了用以表达欲望的“美学经济”产物的发展<sup>7</sup>。通过每次展览与相应文章摘要的交互影响，“万物有灵”展览撼动了“现代社会”宣称所谓万物有灵社会是“其他的”时所建立的边界，并用这种否定构建了自己的身份和先天的优势。

被称为“文献展览的大师”，Franke首先是一个有话

说的策展人；他用展览形式将后殖民主义、科学、生态、伦理和政治问题带进视觉艺术和文化生产的领域中<sup>8</sup>。“万物有灵”展览和他最新的于2014年10月16日在柏林HKW展出的展览“人类世项目”，都探讨了超越文化领域的主题。

虽然“万物有灵”是首个将万物有灵概念应用于西方当代艺术的大规模国际展览，Franke的目标却是带动起“万物有灵论的美学和政治及其重要意义，使其超越今天西方/非西方的二元体系。”<sup>9</sup>因此，巡展的范围要超出欧美国家的范围就显得尤为重要，并使展览内容更加丰富起来。在对OCAT深圳展的评论中，Aimee Lin写道：

“万物有灵”不仅重新从政治、经济和心理学层面思考了殖民主义的问题，更对人类思维和知识体系中无时无刻不存在的殖民主义提出了质疑……通过全球巡展，展览自身就像是一种……极小规模……的……干预。<sup>10</sup>

每一次“万物有灵”展出，展览都会根据展出地点的历史而作出调整。例如在首尔的展览由Franke和Ilmin艺术博物馆重新组织，除之前歌词展览的展品外，还展出馆藏的关于“韩国萨满教的文件、形象、影像和装置”。根据《韩国先驱报》撰稿人Lee Woo-young所述，囊括这些展品是一种方式，让博物馆能够推进“萨满行动”，这是政府从1970年代提出的，“现已在[韩国]工业化和现代化的进程中搁浅。”<sup>11</sup>展览还包括近来几位韩国艺术家探索相关主题的作品，为展览意味深长的复杂叙述添加了一些新的观点。在展览开幕的新闻发布会上，Franke谈到展览追求的是反对“割裂传统与现代”以及表现这样尖锐的分裂会对社会情况产生的负面影响。<sup>12</sup>首尔展的有趣之处还在于它一方面延续了之前展览的讨论，同时在Franke想引人注意的这些理念——现代主义的构建与非西方文化传统和灵性的对立——怎样塑造了首尔的当代文化和历史这一方面也下了功夫。

虽然现在展览已经拓展到八个不同的地方（Franke说下一个目的地是圣保罗），在美国的唯一一次展出却是在纽约E-Flux的展场（2012年）。由于E-Flux杂志支持批判性的讨论，E-Flux展场似乎是一个适合的选择；但笔者很好奇它能怎样向更大规模、更主流的如纽约现代艺术博物馆这样的机构证明自己。对于客体的去等级化理论这一主题，美国仍然有很多重要的工作要做，因此笔者怀疑展览在美国缺少曝光是否就是这种差距的产物，也是这种差距的证据。

尽管用一种更迂回而不够批判性的方式，2011年MoMA主办了一个题为“和我谈谈：设计与人和物间的沟通”的展览，展出300多位设计师的作品，意在通过将新的互动技术和消费产品整合起来，使无生命的世界更容易理解。虽然共享了使物品活起来这一主线，MoMA展览的氛围却更商业化，更以人为中心，批判性也较弱——虽然很多艺术家和设计师做出了非常有批判性的作品。在对展览的介绍中，策展人Paola Antonelli说：

不论是以开放活跃的风格，还是用难以察觉的微妙方式，物品都会对我们说话。物品和系统曾经只是优雅而具有功能，现在却有了人格，能够沟通，使我们的世界更具互动性。<sup>13</sup>

虽然Antonelli的言论所指的是近来沟通的转变，关于有

感召力并很善于表达的物体，也有很多文章指出，这其实是一个物品中早已存在的逐渐更具互动性和可沟通性的过程，而不是戏剧性的转变。那么对笔者来说，更有趣的是现在是什么使物品的这些特点变得如此明显呢？对于明显更具沟通性而非隐晦象征性的沟通信号来讲，在现代主体和资本主义消费者的状态下，消费者更想要什么呢？也许与前文提到的Latour和Franke的对谈中的情感类似，笔者想知道是否也许西方文明的现代主体——不可避免的是消费者——已经开始渴望某种现代性否认的魔力，并赋予物品以技术的灵魂，来使消费世界有生命力，以其闪亮的科技外表通过雷达。

近来在美国，连高架铁路站都张贴了广告劝诫人们不要冒着生命危险爬下铁轨去拣回掉下去的智能手机；购物中心数码相机广告在说“和我旅行，我永远不会忘记一个面孔”，将可降解塑料水瓶描绘成会说“我想变成一条牛仔裤，回收利用我！”的公益广告也为巴士车站增添了色彩。在这个现代主义的时代，用纯粹合乎逻辑的方式解释我们和物品的相似之处已经愈加艰难。现代性夺走了物品的灵魂，使资本主义可以将他们再出售给我们。我们早已经被植入了一系列物品的灵魂，只是缺少清晰的语言来表述。

“万物有灵”这样的展览帮助我们分析了这些矛盾，并将其起源归结于西方现代性内部。正如每当展览来到新的场馆就有更多展品、理论、声音、观点和思考加入进来，思考一些替代方案的可能性也迅猛地增加了。Franke现在的“人类世项目”展是由“万物有灵”展所启发的理论发展而来的，从中可以看出，有时候回望过去也能指引我们走向未来。

注释：

- 1 Anselm Franke著，《万物有灵（卷1）》（柏林：斯腾堡出版社，2010年出版），封底。
- 2 蒲鸿著，“万物有灵”，摘自《深圳OCT万物有灵展览回顾》（广州：艺术界杂志社，2014年出版）。
- 3 Bruno Latour著，Catherine Porter译，《我们从未现代过》（剑桥：哈佛大学出版社，1991年出版），第48页。
- 4 同上，第114页。
- 5 同上，第116页。
- 6 Bruno Latour著，“无翼天使：Bruno Latour与Anselm Franke对谈”，摘自Anselm Franke编《万物有灵（卷1）》（柏林：斯腾堡出版社，2010年出版），第92页。
- 7 同上，第13页。
- 8 《100强：Anselm Franke》（伦敦：艺术评论杂志社，2013年出版）。
- 9 摘自为深圳OCT展出的“万物有灵”展览所写的展览宣言“万物有灵：画上线条”（香港：Para Site，2013年出版）。
- 10 Aimee Lin著，《万物有灵——论深圳OCT“万物有灵”展》（伦敦：艺术评论杂志社，2013年出版）。
- 11 Lee Woo-young著，《古老信仰在转型到现代性过程中日渐式微》（首尔：韩国Herald出版社，2013年出版）。
- 12 同上。
- 13 Paola Antonelli著，《和我谈谈：设计与人和物间的沟通》（纽约：现代艺术博物馆，2011年出版），封底。

The first annual International Awards for Art Criticism were held in Shanghai in November 2014. They are almost certainly the most open, and the most generously endowed Awards of their kind and provide a fascinating insight into the range of contemporary writing about art. As a record of some of the best entries of the 2014–15 Awards competition, this book serves as a chronicle of the year's contemporary art exhibitions taking place around the world. While the two bases of the award are in Shanghai and London, and the languages for submissions are Chinese and English, this is a genuinely international project, with entries from as many as 40 different countries, on all the continents, and 22 regions or cities within China itself.

国际艺术评论奖首次于2014年11月在上海举办。与同类奖项相比,该奖项几乎可以说是最具开放性且受资助金额最高的艺术评论类奖项,为当代艺术的评论及写作提供极具吸引力的启示。本出版物既作为该奖项的历史记录,亦是针对所规定年份期限内全球展览及相关评论的编年史。该奖项同时以上海及伦敦为立足点,以中、英文为投稿文章所用语言。作为一个真正意义上的国际性项目,第一届奖项共征集了全球范围内40余个国家以及中国范围内22个地区/城市的投稿。

#### **Prize Winners**

##### **获奖者**

Su Wei / 苏伟

Zhang Hanlu / 张涵露

Joobin Bekhrad / 裘宾·贝克哈尔德

#### **Selected Entries in English**

##### **英文入围者**

Kayla Anderson / 凯拉·安德生

Andrew Brighton / 安德鲁·布莱顿

Rachel Dedman / 瑞秋·戴德

Natasha Degen / 娜塔莎·德根

Ellen C. Feiss / 艾伦·C·菲斯

Roos van der Lint / 卢斯·凡·德·林特

Iris Xinru Long / 龙星如

Maija Rudovska / 玛嘉·鲁道夫丝卡

Jonathan P. Watts / 乔纳森·P·瓦兹

#### **Selected Entries in Chinese**

##### **中文入围者**

Li Sisi / 李思思

Liu Xujun / 刘旭俊

Roger Mandle / 罗杰·满德

Qu Yue / 翟月

Wu Wei / 吴蔚

Wu Mo / 武漢

Yang Beichen / 杨北辰

Zhou Xin / 周昕

