Introduction: staging art and Chineseness

This is a book about the politics of borders in the era of global art, specifically the borders ascribed to Chinese contemporary art and the identification of Chinese artists by locations and exhibitions. Globalization in the twenty-first century has re-drawn the landscape of art and art history, transforming the cultural mapping, the ideologies, and methodologies for the study of contemporary art produced by cultures that were categorized as ‘non-Western’ during the twentieth century. The period of the 1980s and 1990s has come to be seen as a turning point for the new global art category that emerged with global expositions as the new art institution – biennials, triennials, artfairs – appearing across the globe in places such as Guangzhou, Taipei, Fukuoka, Gwangju, and Busan, to name just a few in the regions of Asia. One of the most oft-cited examples of global art is Chinese contemporary art, and significantly, the phenomenon of China’s shiyan meishu experimental art also appeared on the stage of exhibitions in Europe and the United States during the 1980s and 1990s. The most notable example is the 1993 inclusion of fourteen artists from China in the Venice Biennale for the first time in the exposition’s 100-year history. The year before, curator Lu Peng had assisted in organizing the 1992 Guangzhou Biennial, the first-ever biennial-type art exposition held in China.1 But writing in reference to the landmark Venice Biennale show, Lu asserted ‘the global “historical passage” that began in 1993 was not only Chinese contemporary art history but an integral component of global art history.’2 China plays a remarkable recurring role in the political leitmotif of global art and global expositions, providing the impetus for this historical study on Staging Art and Chineseness: The Politics of Trans/Nationalism and Global Expositions.

The underlying political inquiry of this book is in regard to both the temporal spaces and physical borders of transnational capitalism. If indeed the period of the 1980s and 1990s experimental art in China represents the paradigmatic shift to global art, then China’s transition during the same period to the market economy that ended Mao’s socialist alternative to capitalism can be viewed as a major historical development in both ‘global art history’ and
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critical theory. The 1992 Guangzhou Biennial functions as the opening act for the mise-en-scène of political contradictions – as Lu explains, ‘since the 1990s, the only support for Chinese contemporary art has come from the market and the international resources that it brought.’ The entrepreneurial force of an inchoate capitalism permitted him to stage the 1992 Biennial in Guangzhou, when just three years earlier, on 4 June 1989, the Chinese Communist Party via the People’s Liberation Army literally took aim at the Tiananmen Square protesters who were seeking the same sort of freedom of expression as Lu. But the curator’s statement at the time was in defense of criticism by Westerners who thought China’s avant-garde artists had sold out to the politics of capitalism: ‘All of these critics should know, however, that sales, capital and profit have been chasing the tail of the Venice Biennale since its first installment. Except for the “storm” of anti-capitalist sentiment and protest that swept through several European countries in 1968, capital and the market have never left art.’ Lu cites the misreading of China’s anti-capitalist position by the West, stemming from the events of revolution in the 1960s, when the European avant-gardist ideal for art aligned with Mao’s anti-bourgeois appeal – Mao’s 1942 ‘Talks at the Yanan Conference for Literature and Art’ would establish his avant-garde bonafides in the West. And as reiterated by theorist Liu Kang, Mao’s influence on the development of Marxist structuralism was integral to the European resistances in 1968, represented chiefly by Louis Althusser who ‘identified the critique of capitalist modernity as a central problematic in his deployment of Mao’s theories and practices of socialist revolution.’ Paradoxically, art history’s relationship to critical theory – the Frankfurt School since the 1930s – was defined by an artistic praxis of capitalist resistance that functioned also to combat the fascism of Hitler and the authoritarianism of the likes of Mao during the twentieth century. The point, however, is that the philosophical premise of Marxism was a shared conception during the 1960s and was an outcome of both Maoist and Althusserian analyses.

Raising the specter of Althusser and the impact of Maoist philosophy on his work, my argument for this book returns to his formative concept that ‘contradiction is inseparable from the total structure of the social body,’ which is particularly resonant for the contradictions of globalization in art and exhibitions. The stakes have been raised by the current cycle of multinational-petro-capitalism and the anthropocenic (or capitalocenic) distinction that is nonetheless inextricable from the earlier industrial model. Althusser’s theorization of the ‘past images of consciousness’ suggests that the greater impact of capitalist structures is produced through ‘echoes (memories, phantoms of historicity) of what it has become, that is, as anticipations of or allusions to itself. Because the past is never more than the internal essence (itself) of the future it encloses.’ The structure of twentieth-century industrial
capitalism continuing into twenty-first-century global capitalism constitutes a renewed social apparatus for the ideologies of global art – the radically ‘new’ biennial in Guangzhou stages the phantom of its historicity from the Venice Biennale. *Staging Art and Chineseness* addresses the new global art ideal by acknowledging the multiple contradictions, the paradoxes, and the repetitions of history engendered by status, nationalism, and capital in the globalization of art and exhibitions.

The book’s primary inquiry, however, is on the paradoxical subject of *Chineseness*, which begins with the question, what does the term *Chinese art* mean in the aftermath of the globalized shift in art? Ever since experimental artists in the 1980s visualized the epochal change in the advent of Deng Xiaoping’s political reforms, the emergence of China’s xiandai yishujia (contemporary artists) has largely been the defining focus of Chinese art. The term in the twenty-first century evokes the vast and profitable production of China’s artists who are currently represented in exhibitions and auctions (along with the curatorial and scholarly texts that inform them) in China and in countries worldwide. Recognizing the difference in representations of Chinese artists who live and work outside of China, the word Chineseness has come to be associated with those who circulate transnationally among the Chinese states of China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan, and diasporic places elsewhere. Since the 1980s and 1990s, when Rey Chow published her influential essay ‘On Chineseness as a Theoretical Problem,’ the word has also meant something inimically different in its association with the objectification and appropriation of Chinese culture based on the lack of representation by the Chinese themselves under Western methods for displaying cultures. According to this latter definition, the most nefarious example of Chineseness was displayed as an ethnographical subject, one that began with the ‘human showcases’ and Chinese villages run by anthropology departments in the nineteenth-century world’s fairs, continuing into the 1930s with the exotica Chinese female subject of misogyny in transnational cinema. As visual representations viewed on a worldwide scale, these are among the various stereotypes ascribed to the Chinese subject during the twentieth century. The most insidious are the miscegenist depictions of Chinese women in film and popular culture, and one of the underlying feminist motivations of this book is to expose this stereotype specifically. The exotica distinction of Chineseness is inextricable from a history of cultural imperialism, one that aligns with Said’s explanation of Orientalism as not simply ‘an airy European fantasy about the Orient, but a created body of theory and practice in which, for many generations, there has been a considerable material investment.’ To many, Orientalism’s capitalist investment in an *inauthentic* Chinese culture had established the ‘phantoms of historicity,’ the stereotypes of Chineseness that continue to haunt conceptions of Chinese culture today.
In the twenty-first century, however, the concept of cultural authenticity has been problematized, and in the advent of China’s assimilation into the global market economy, the expressive differences among artists from China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan, as well as among diasporic artists living in all parts of the world, put into question whose Chinese culture in particular should be considered as ‘authentic.’ Chineseness in the general definition today refers to the diverse subjectivity of Chinese artists wherever they reside. Thus, the term Chinese art in contemporary culture refers first to the inscription of the artist as representative of Chinese states and second to the classifications of exhibitions by national affiliation, such as the pavilions for China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong at the Venice Biennale (as a very obvious example). The new challenge taken up by Staging Art and Chineseness puts to the test the very premise of the genealogical inscription for Chinese contemporary art and the ways in which cultural objects are attributed to territories, usually through the status of residency, homeland, or citizenship of their makers – the artist determines the category of Chinese art more so than the object’s affiliations by cultural tradition, style, or practice.

As a discourse, Chineseness has meant different things in different contexts, as shown by theorists such as Gao Minglu and Ien Ang, who provide various perspectives on the term’s use in defining Chinese exceptionalism, stereotype, and status. During the 1990s, shiyàn méishù experimental artists such as Gu Wenda and Xu Bing often addressed the synthesis of culture through re-envisioning language and Chinese characters. For his ongoing United Nations Series begun in 1993, Gu created unreadable letters and characters in different languages by using the material of hair collected from barbershops in the different countries where he exhibited his installation. Curator Gao Minglu suggests that the project initiated a ‘model of universalism’ for cultural expression.\(^1\) In contrast, media/cultural studies researcher Ien Ang explains the meaning of the term subjectively as a ‘label more than anything else’ from her experience growing up in Indonesia. ‘Even though my father was a peranakan Chinese who never spoke any Chinese, his family had not spoken any Chinese for generations, for some reason his family was still called a “Chinese” family.’\(^1\) Not unlike Édouard Glissant’s theory of creolization, Chineseness is useful for re-conceptualizing the mundialization of Chinese identity. Glissant describes ‘the mutual mutations generated by this interplay of relations’ that contribute to what he calls the ‘principles of creoleness.’\(^1\) The principles of Chineseness share mutual mutations in an interplay of relations that circulate around Chinese exceptionalism as well as Orientalism. Wang Gungwu published his 1991 book The Chineseness of China to continue his inquiry into the exceptional Chinese identity defined by Chinese tradition and values as opposed to the ‘disloyal expression of Chineseness.’ Those who assimilate overseas would lose their distinction, much like his own experience
since he was ‘born in Indonesia, trained as an historian of China in England, teaching first at Kuala Lumpur and then at Canberra, finally ... becoming Vice-Chancellor of the University of Hong Kong.’

Allen Chun explains further the shifting belief in the Han ethnic unity that had changed under ‘the term chung-kuo [zhongguo in pinyin or middle kingdom]’ as distinct from ‘Chineseness as hua-hsia,’ which signifies a ‘metaphorical defense of a traditional past that contrasts with the extreme radicalism of a communist worldview.’ The authenticity of Chinese identity has been a complex subject of debate in China’s long history, and from 1949 to 1976, it was irrevocably transformed by Mao’s revolution – the Soviet influences in the 1950s could be seen in the impact of socialist realist painting until Mao’s death in 1976. While the emergence of China’s contemporary art in the 1980s may seem to mark the sudden change from a ‘genuine’ Chinese artistic tradition, the cross-hybrid fusion of Western and Chinese influences in the arts had begun much earlier, even before socialist realism, since industrialization after the Opium Wars resulted in modernist expression amidst the 1860s internationalism of Shanghai. Nonetheless, the shiyan meishu experimental movement of the 1980s and 1990s in China established the contemporary shift in the development of tradition and style, reflecting the mutual mutations of cultural expression.

Chineseness is a changing concept that functions in this book to confirm the problem of identification by viewing through the lens of Chinese artists as they address the misconception of the cultural ‘self’ in the social sphere. Not unlike other inquiries into cultural/ethnic syncretism in globalization, the theoretical connections of Chineseness are conceived by identifications according to movements across geographical borders and embodiments of citizenship. In the aftermath of the political events of 2016, identity by national borders and citizenship has become highly political, as exemplified by Brexit’s anti-globalization position in parallel with the election of Donald Trump, who closed the US borders to asylum seekers and many other immigrant groups. The meaning of the term globalization has changed from positive notions of the far-reaching connections of the worldwide web and the advantages of a global economy. To the anti-globalists, the idea of ‘internationalism’ appears as a nostalgic term for the ‘good, old days,’ when the world was enfranchized and mapped according to Europe and North America. The internationalism of the museum world during the 1980s and 1990s when contemporary artists from China were first presented in American and European exhibitions has now been transformed by the global development of museums in metropolitan cities such as Shanghai. As explored in Chapter Five of this book, museums have become important civic centers and tourist sites and about a thousand museums were built in China during the first decade of the twenty-first century.
In the context of art, however, those connections across borders were never easy propositions because subjects of identity in relation to artistic expressions have always been problematic – the representation of a person, a community, a culture through material and immaterial objects (including photography and film) could never be fully accurate portrayals. This book focuses on embodied representations of Chinese artists in order to address the problem through performance and video manifestations, as represented in the work of Patty Chang, Zhang Huan, Wong Hoy Cheong, Cao Fei, Yuk King Tan, Wu Mali, Lee Ming-sheng, Lin Shumin, Ho Siu Kee, Stanley Wong, and Cai Guo-Qiang. As artists who identify as residents of China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, the United States, and other diasporic locations, their use of performative, embodied, and video expressions provides a way to engage the subject of the artist’s ‘self’ as an open and apparent representation of nation, immigration, citizenship, and transnationalism – in this way, they provide a particular opportunity to represent identity artistically. This book’s study of Chineseness is therefore represented by the artists themselves as their video performances help to clarify the paradoxical meaning of the term. The explicit focus on the role of film, screen, performance/body in individual and collective ways underpin the critical analysis in the first three chapters, which eventually leads to the focus on the analysis of exhibitions in the last two chapters since the structures of biennials and triennials have long represented nations and locations.

While this book seeks to make sense of Chineseness in relation to the global art shift since the 1990s, the ecofeminist portrayals of the artists Patty Chang, Cao Fei, Wu Mali, and Yuk King Tan provide an activist approach as their transnational endeavors transform the function of global contemporary art. The term ecofeminism is attributed to 1970s feminist advocates such as Francoise d’Eaubonne who connected the domination of the environment to patriarchal oppression. The movement has since developed into a global advocacy, and the ecofeminist strategies adopted by the artists in this book are ones that actively address environmental issues by transgressing the patriarchal conventions of capitalist nationalism with its domination over land and resources. They provide a clear example of the expansion of transnationalism in the terminology of the transgressive, the transformative, and the translational, since their focus on issues affecting the ecological borders of the planet are those that are inextricable from the political borders of the nation.

But even as artists themselves confront the larger issues of migration, citizenship, and exile through presenting their own bodies as the subject and object of art, the engagement with the viewer can never be fully accounted for through artistic representation. The perfect example for this dilemma is conveyed by the bodily-oriented performances of two comparative artists explored in Chapter One of this book: China-born artist Zhang Huan and
Chinese American artist Patty Chang. In his project My America (1999–2002), Zhang confronts issues of migration and assimilation related to his own experience relocating to the United States by enlisting members of his new American community to participate in his performance events. As one of the experimental artists of the 1980s–1990s generation, his early work resonates for Chineseness at the end of the 1990s explicitly – Zhang’s use of his own naked body (along with the participants’ naked bodies) as the subject and object of the viewers’ gaze places the focus on the live, human subject of the artist in the midst of his configured social body. The juxtaposition of naked bodies has the potential to disrupt the stereotypes and assumptions surrounding the Chinese ‘immigrant.’

In contrast, Chang’s video performances, such as Minor (2010), can be viewed as the Chinese American counterpart to My America, since she travels to inner and outer parts of China, including the Xinjiang autonomous region in the northwest where she engaged with the Muslim Uyghur community. Chang’s focus through her video lens projected onto her peripatetic Chinese American self juxtaposed with her Uyghur and Han Chinese subjects in Xinjiang puts into question the ‘ethnicity’ of being Chinese, one that is openly disavowed by many of the Uyghur population. Chang represents the contradictions of Chineseness in the reverse of a history of immigration acts forbidding movements to the United States from China. The conditions of power that exist in Uyghur-Han relations are different from the white heterosexual norm in the United States; however, the patriarchal hierarchies of nationalism continue to inform both Chang and Zhang’s works. The underlying transnational feminist position of this book is one that recognizes the historical structures of nationalism as patriarchal formations. However, all feminist studies are specific in the ways in which they provide a particular context and perspective, and this study aligns with Aihwa Ong’s ideal for ‘narratives of nation and community [that] position women within special conditions for expressing their moral agency,’ proposing a resistance to ‘the hegemonic project of nationalism.’ Through performance and video, both Chang and Zhang embody the ontological concept of the ‘self’ as a product of ethnic borders, nationalisms, and legislated citizenship. Because the artists are problematizing the concepts of authentic and inauthentic Chinese identity, they ultimately disrupt the hegemonic norms of nationalism since the body cannot fully divulge the inscriptions of ethnicity or nationality. Feminist theorists, notably Amelia Jones, have addressed the body’s unique failure in identificatory-art practices, and as Peggy Phelan wrote in her analysis of performance, ‘identity emerges in the failure of the body to express being fully and the failure of the signifier to convey meaning exactly.’ According to Phelan, artistic engagement with identity requires a relationship with the viewer in an artistic exchange that is ultimately inextricable from ‘self-seeing’ and ‘self-being.’
Moreover, in the digital currents by which photography and video have become essential for any artistic practice in the understanding that all artworks will end up on the computer screens of social media, the ‘screen-based’ discourse that pertains to Chang’s video work requires further study into the diversity of practices invoked by performance. As Claire Bishop points out, while most art today ‘deploys new technology at one if not most stages of its production, dissemination, and consumption,’ the lack of cogent responses to digitization in contemporary art has been ‘striking ... so little of it seems to address the way in which the forms and languages of new media have altered our relationship to perception, history, language, and social relations.’

Taking after the objectives and strategies of film theorists such as Rey Chow, Shu-mei Shih, Kwai-Cheung Lo, and Sheldon Hsiao-peng Lu, this book acknowledges the differences in the visual field of representation and seeks to clarify the use of video performances to express embodiments in relation to the locations of Chinese culture. The medium is unique because of its usefulness for the analyses of film interpellation and Chinese identity, which is often the focus of the aforementioned film theorists. The conceptualism of the visual art practice is different, however, from the movie/cinema representation, especially in regards to the performance/bodily-oriented works that constitute the primary artistic subjects of this book. The intervention of video changes the live art performance but functions to expand the cultural vocabulary of the film form in the Youtube age – the liveness of Chang’s performance in Minor, for instance, connects to the extemporaneous sensibility of capturing an event, a moment. Added to this, the metaphysical meaning that contemporary artists have developed for the individual media of performance and video, Minor is able to convey multiple complex ideas in a transnational context. Notwithstanding the potential discrepancies and misrepresentations of identity in the performative/video engagement, both Zhang and Chang exemplify the embodiments of the subjects, issues, histories, and inquiries explored in this book through their bodily-oriented works.

The theoretical objective of Staging Art and Chineseness is therefore to connect the performance video subjects of Chineseness to the greater historical scope of ‘geographical consciousness’ and assumptions of culture by location and nation. While works by global contemporary artists are still representative of their respective geographical territories, the ideals ascribed to their artworks and exhibits can be understood as reflexive of the continuities of analyses of social consciousness, particularly those established by historical Marxism for industrial capitalism, which Althusser considers as ‘phantoms of historicity.’ A study of the historical matrix of global expositions can provide the structural connections among art, culture, capital, and nation. The book therefore acknowledges the system of representation in which global art expositions such as the 1992 Guangzhou Biennial inevitably carry the
structural tendencies of the Venice Biennale, the world’s fairs, and the long
European history of cultural management, including the way in which global
expositions themselves construct the imagined communities of China, Hong
Kong, and Taiwan. Acknowledging this system of exhibition as an important
form for identifying culture, the book’s interconnected case studies function
to define, interpret, and exemplify the concept of Chineseness in contempo-
rary and historical contexts for art. The discourses of the colonial, the post-
colonial, and the subsequent decolonial processes are at the center of these
contexts, and they are also played out in the curatorial subjects, exhibitionary
ideals, and organizing principles of global expositions.

As Walter Benjamin once wrote, ‘world exhibitions are places of pilgrimg
to the commodity fetish’ because their organizing principles ‘glorify the
exchange value of the commodity. They create a framework in which its use
value recedes into the background ... Its ingenuity in representing inanimate
objects corresponds to what Marx calls the “theological niceties” of the com-
modity.’\(^{20}\) Benjamin went on to explain that Marx’s ‘theological niceties’ were
manifested by the ‘spécialité – a category of goods which appears at this time
in the luxuries industry’ – and fine art objects were exactly the kind of luxe
objects that could fulfill the secular role for the worship of special things in
capitalist modernity.\(^{21}\) When the Venice Biennale was inaugurated in 1895,
nearly every metropolitan city in the world had hosted a world’s fair, and
Venice’s artfair would take as its model the competition among industrial
nations for displaying Benjamin’s ‘theological niceties’ of the commodity.
The aesthetic essentialism of the fine arts, showcased in palaces attributed
to European and North American nations, would be contrasted with the
display of artworks considered as ethnographical artefacts attributed to ‘non-
Western’ cultures at the world’s fairs.

As denoted by the very first inclusion of China’s artists in the 1993 Venice
Biennale, China was not among the nations represented at the 1895 Venice
Biennale, and it would take another 100 years before the country would be
invited by Biennale director Achille Bonito Oliva to exhibit for the first time
in the international group show titled ‘Passagio a Oriente.’\(^{22}\) In the decades to
come, official pavilions would also be dedicated for the first time to Taiwan in
of the first inclusion of Chinese artists in the Venice Biennale to the attention
garnered from the 1992 Guangzhou Biennial. The important role of the cura-
tor in the globalized shift of biennials and triennials informs the case studies
in the final chapters of this book. As curatorial forerunners in China, the
leadership of Lu Peng, Wu Hung, Huang Zhiuan, Feng Boyi, Gao Shiming,
Sarat Maharaj, and Chang Tsong-zung was highly influential in the rewriting
of Chineseness. This study also acknowledges the transnational contributions
to the development of global expositions in the larger scope by curators such
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As Okwui Enwezor and Adam Szymczyk for Documentas 11 (2002) and 14 (2017) respectively. As the first African curator at the quinquennial exhibition held in Kassel, Germany, Enwezor’s 2001 curatorial premise was built on five political ‘platforms,’ in which the third platform foregrounded Glissant’s globalized identity of the ‘Creolite and Creolization’ as an exploration for Documenta 11.

As the counterpart to the world’s fair trajectory of the Venice Biennale, Documenta’s history as a political event began in 1955 through its well-known role as a ‘corrective to the infamous 1937 Nazi exhibition Entartete Kunst (‘degenerate art’) in order to construct a rehabilitating narrative of modernism for the German people.’ While the quinquennial serves as a prime example of the twenty-first-century global art exposition, Walter Grasskamp argues that ‘documenta in its beginnings was not really an international show. It was not even a proper European one, but in fact a very German event.’ Of 148 artists on the inaugural official roster, 58 were German participants, with the rest consisting of artists representing France, Italy, Britain, Switzerland, and Holland. Ultimately, the 1955 Documenta subscribed to the organizing principles of the 1895 Venice Biennale in a cartography described by Grasskamp as a ‘surrealistic world map of “twentieth century art” (“kunst des XX. Jahrhunderts”), which was what the first documenta claimed to cover; as surrealistic a map as the national pavilions in the Venice Giardini in winter.’ Even the ‘unofficial’ exhibitions of artists ascribed to ‘nearly every Western European and Central European country’ at the first Documenta followed in the hierarchical nationalism of the Venice Biennale.

The formative period for the global art shift is attributed to the late 1990s, but if indeed the biennials, triennials, and artfairs are representative of the ‘new’ exhibitions of global art, then how do they relate to the longstanding biennial models, such as the Venice Biennale begun in 1895 and Documenta’s emulation in 1955? The fundamental legacy handed down from the Biennale is that the ‘staging’ of the artist in the context of the exhibition is always-already representing nation and culture through the biennial’s entrenched meanings, categorization, signifiers, and symbolism of display. In this way, Chineseness has been represented as both a national and cultural identity at the global art expositions, both in China and in the historical European biennials/triennials.

Chapter overview

Chapter One’s study, ‘Chineseness as a theoretical, historical, and political problem in global art and exhibition,’ sets the stage by introducing and defining the discourse on Chineseness with its particular history of political debates instantiated by Rey Chow’s influential 1998 essay. Chow had established the important dialogue through addressing the problem raised
by Said’s analysis of the hegemonic West in *Orientalism*, which she reads specifically for her analysis of the fetishization of Chinese ‘subject-races.’ Her interpretation of Chineseness acknowledges the paradox of the cultural logic of European exclusivism coexisting with the narcissistic, megalomaniacal fantasy of China as an unattainably superior culture. In art-historical terms, these inauthentic forms of Chineseness can be understood as perpetuated through European elitism in art and its domination of art historical narratives – seen in the absence of Chinese representation in the history of Modern Art, while on the other hand, the blockbuster exhibitions of ‘5000 years of ancient Chinese art’ confirm the megalomanic fantasy of Orientalism. In this context, ‘Chineseness’ was negatively viewed by its attachment to the Orientalist inscription, and as late as 2005, the term was considered contentious because it signified appropriation, reductivism, and inauthentic forms of representation.

This chapter explains how Chineseness has moved away from its controversial meaning and has been used by theorists and historians to specify the shifting, variable, unfixed meanings attached to Chinese culture. Conceptions of Chineseness are nonetheless contingent on many authentic and inauthentic factors for identity and identification. In the advent of Stuart Hall’s analysis of race as a ‘floating signifier’ and Judith Butler’s questioning of gender performance, the subjective instability of identity is the only conception that can be consistently attributed to Chineseness. In mainstream representations, however, the word has come to be used to distinguish the difference among the Chinese in China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan, and among the diasporic Chinese generally. Film theorists, including Chow, Sheldon Hsiao-peng Lu, and Shu-mei Shih, were some of the first researchers to have used the term in this way as Chineseness became a subject of *interpellation* in movies and documentary film. Chow denoted the structuralist concept originating from the dialectical theories of Althusser, which remarkably were also influenced by his reading of Mao. Interpellation is not simply the practice of self-recognition by viewers of film, but is a form of political recognition of human beings who are made into subjects through historical economic and social conditions. The remarkable changes of those conditions in China has brought Chineseness into the forefront of the socio-political economy of representation.

Althusser’s exploration of Maoist thought was developed later by his students, including Jacques Rancière and Alain Badiou, both of whom have contributed significantly to contemporary art discourse while conserving in varying degrees the use of Maoist alternatives to capitalism through discourse. The fragments and traces of historical materialism in the structural philosophies for art, affecting representation and identity, can be seen as continuing in Rancière and Badiou’s approaches to the discourse. Their position is compatible with this book’s study on contemporary art as Chineseness.
functions to acknowledge the synthesis of philosophical discourses, not unlike the shifting and variable syntheses of cultural influences on the notion of Chinese identity. Perhaps Marxism’s greatest contribution was its global and intellectual reach across cultures and languages through its analytical framework for understanding class consciousness. As the theoretical focus of Chapter One, the discourse on Chineseness engages interdisciplinary aspects of intellectual thought, and its representation is therefore connected to the different subjects of this book including ecofeminism, art history, and global expositions. The chapter’s explanation of Chineseness functions overall to situate the different approaches to transnationalism as they relate to video performances and exhibitions.

The artists chosen for this book are primarily those who evoke the gendered and raced body explicitly in order to define and examine the subject and object that pertains to geographic origins and movements. But ultimately, these artists were chosen because they have in some way or other challenged the norm of representing cultural boundaries. The most important among them are artists who address the feminist subject, which is a key investigation of this book exemplified by Chapter Two’s study on ‘Patty Chang and the transnational cinematic subject of Chineseness.’ The examination of three video performances in which Chang addresses the very subject of cinema and its historical impact on Chinese stereotypes is a reconceptualization of three different transnational films and movies from the 1920s and 1930s. Chang’s retrospective focus on early film acknowledges the constructions of gender and race in the diverse world of ethnography, Orientalist fantasy, and miscegenistic desire in twentieth-century cinema. At the same time, Chang is peripatetically traveling to the ‘real’ places in China as a Chinese American.

In this way, Chapter Two defines transnationalism as the key concept for this book, and through Chang’s diverse Chinese subjects, especially in the autonomous outer regions of Turkic-Uyghur Xinjiang in the north and the Diqing Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture in the south, the study presents a foundation for Chapter Three’s Chinese subjects in Hong Kong, Taiwan, and China. Chapter Two’s close analysis of Minor (2010), for instance, will show how Chang emulates the travelogue of ethnographic film as the artist retrace the expeditions in the 1920s and 1930s of Sven Hedin, the Swedish explorer, to Xinjiang and the Lop Nor region of northern China. The journey was documented by Paul Lieberenz, Hedin’s cohort, whose 1928 anthropology film titled With Sven Hedin Across the Deserts of Asia depicts his caravan with no less than 300 camels. Hedin’s scientific objectives were just as ostentatious. Trained as a geographer in Germany, the explorer was part of the Lebensraum school of geography and anthropology in the service of empire, and his scientific worldview was shaped by Aryan racial determinism as an ideology of the German National-Socialist movement.29
Chang’s video project shows a radically different approach to her ‘ethnographic subjects,’ including her video’s discovery of an exhibition of mummies in which the female mummy, the *Beauty of Loulan*, is among the eight others she discovers in a local museum. Chang offers an embodied sensibility for viewing objects of ancestry and ethnicity as she seeks to connect the mummified past with the vanishing present. Meeting a young Uyghur girl in Xinjiang, who could potentially be a descendant of the Beauty of Loulan, she creates her ‘ethnographic video’ by staging her in the same embodied pose of the mummy artefact laying prone. This embodied gesture pays homage to the ethnographic intervention that James Luna first presented in *Artefact Piece* (1987), his famous performance at San Diego’s Museum of Man, whereby he staged his own living breathing Luiseño Native American self by laying prone in a vitrine in the anthropology museum. Luna challenged the ethnographical stereotype that characterized his Native community as dead and extinct due to primitivism. Chang’s presentation of the embodied female subject of the Muslim Uyghur community shares the same sense of live human representation since the Uyghur inhabitants of the autonomous region of China are often viewed by similar stereotypes of primitivism and extinction. The fact that the Han Chinese are discriminating against the Uyghur community re-defines cultural hegemony as a concept that encompasses much more than Eurocentric power.

The second work explored in Chapter Two is Chang’s 2005 project *Shangri-La*, which brought her to Zhongdian in the southwest province of Yunnan and the Diqing Tibetan Autonomous Prefecture. The local government won a national contest to change the name of Zhongdian to Xianggelila (Shangri-La) in order to capitalize on concepts of paradise from James Hilton’s 1933 novel *Lost Horizon*. Through her video installation, Chang reproduces the film fantasy that Frank Capra interpreted for his 1937 movie version of *Lost Horizon*, the story of a plane crash in the Himalayas that led to the discovery of Shangri-La, an ethno-fantastic place of immortality run by a Buddhist lamasery. Through her conceptual video, Chang literally re-constructs the elements of lore from Capra’s Shangri-La while working with the community of Xianggelila to build the sculptural replica of the awe-inspiring mountains made from angled pieces of mirror, as well as to recreate the Shangri-La cake that Capra presented at the cast party at the closing of his 1937 film. Chang’s subject is the concept of *fabrication* itself, emphasized by a screen shot of the enormous billboard welcoming visitors to the fabricated town of Xianggelila. But overall, her video juxtaposes the illusions of fantasy with the overwhelming sense of the *real* place of Diqing’s mountainous terrain at the Tibetan border of China.

*Die Ware Liebe* (2009), Chang’s third and final work explored in Chapter Two, reconceives the cinematic subject of the 1930s film star Anna May
Wong, the most well-known Chinese American actress in Hollywood, who was always cast as the illicit love object for white men in film fantasies of miscegenation. Her characters usually died at the end of the film to exact the penalty for her ‘immorality.’ Chang writes Wong a new cinematic script based on Walter Benjamin’s 1928 essay titled ‘Gespräch mit Anne May Wong’ (A Conversation with Anna May Wong, also subtitled ‘A Chinoiserie Out of the Old West’), which was Benjamin’s provocative interview with Wong. Chang’s complex project engages the viewer in the production of her movie, allowing the viewer to see behind the scenes in the company of Gu Bo, the Chinese director hired by Chang. We watch as the director instructs the two characters Walter Benjamin and Anna May Wong played by the Chinese actors Hu Huaizhong and Yi Ping as they engage in a pornographic love scene.

Die Ware Liebe’s script for Wong’s character ultimately re-writes the scene of race and miscegenation by re-conceptualizing the historical form of Brechtian alienation. Chang’s video visualizes Rancière’s ‘emancipated spectator’ and his use of Brecht to ‘dismiss the opposition between looking and acting and [to] understand that the distribution of the visible itself is part of the configuration of domination and subjection.’ Chang returns to 1920s and 1930s film to re-distribute and reconfigure the historical domination and subjection of Chinese people and places, as Minor emulates the documentary real of Lieberenz’s With Sven Hedin Across the Deserts of Asia only to upend the historical impact of Hedin’s vision for geographical empire. But then in Shangri-La Chang uses the documentary form to compare a past and present transnational construction of a fantastical Chineseness. Finally, her rewritten script for Anna May Wong is a critique of the transnational practice of movie-making itself, exposing the profound effects of 1920s cinema on the construction of race and gender by visualizing what it might mean to see the celebrated Marxist philosopher in a Chinese body. The distinct ways in which Chang uses video to conceptualize a radically different understanding of cinema in relation to the Chinese subject reveals the unique advantages of video performance as a medium.

Chapter Three’s study on ‘Environment, labor, and video: (eco)feminist interpellations of Chineseness in the work of Yuk King Tan, Cao Fei, and Wu Mali’ provides further exploration of performance and the videographic form as used by these artists to address the twenty-first-century problems facing Hong Kong, China, and Taiwan. Focusing on the concept of ecofeminism, their works representing the places of their respective Chinese states share the aesthetic engagement in which the viewer is staged to know themselves as the ‘human’ who is responsible for the anthropocenic shift. The term, of late, has been used to define global warming and climate change as ecological conditions that result from human interference in natural processes. Viewed as ecofeminist interpellations, however, the issues of labor and environmental
crises expressed by Tan, Cao, and Wu are representative of the patriarchal drive for power and domination that constitutes the very foundation of global capitalism. It is important to acknowledge that the historical norm of capitalist power was always associated with the colonialist conquer of native lands (extended now to the conquer of the planet), which was consistently fueled by the patriarchal desire for material wealth that has led to the twenty-first-century depletion of natural resources, pollution, waste, and ecological disasters. The final colonialist occupation of territories as the means to profit from natural resources can be viewed as the power to conquer the earth itself.

The primary factor driving man-made ecological disaster is the expansion of global capitalism, by which the industries of Hong Kong, China, and Taiwan serve as textbook examples for industrial cycles of boom and bust economic crisis under Marx’s theory of surplus value. The 1970s manifestation of this theory can be perceived in the ‘Taiwan Miracle,’ which refers to the exponential economic growth of the small island nation of just 23 million people, built largely on high tech suppliers, microelectronics, and textile manufacturing. The rate of industrial growth peaked in 1980, around the time that Deng Xiaoping introduced his reforms on the mainland, but has steadily tapered off in Taiwan since then. Taking its place, China’s industrial boom was initiated in 1990, when the Shanghai stock market reopened for the first time since 1949, and was solidified by 2001 when the country became part of the World Trade Organization. Amidst the economic boom on the mainland, however, the economic interdependence of Taiwan, Hong Kong, and China has grown. As Peter Chow argues,

> if Hong Kong is grouped with China, Taiwan’s trade dependency on China’s markets accounts for nearly 40 percent of its total exports, and outward foreign direct investment has been increasing steadily, with more than 60 percent of capital outflows destined for China. Industrial clusters in the Yangtze River Delta, the Pearl River Delta, and other parts of China were created through foreign invested enterprises, many of them from Taiwan, and have accounted for a substantial percentage of China’s total exports to the world.

The cycle of boom and bust in the economies of Taiwan, China and Hong Kong are now interrelated; the primary social shift that occurred in the booms of Taiwan and China was the migration of workers from the agricultural centers in the countryside to the newly formed manufacturing districts. As explored in Chapter Three, artists Wu Mali and Cao Fei address the impact of this migration on the lives of women. Wu’s 1997 video installation, *Stories of Women from Hsin-Chuang*, documents the narratives of textile workers in Hsin-Chuang, Taiwan, who left their farming villages at a very early age to work in the factories. As young women, they were sent as laborers by their parents in order to support the university education of their brothers, an
opportunity not traditionally given to Chinese girls. Wu does not offer a typical documentary film to recount the women’s experiences; instead, her conceptual expression engages the viewer through a montage of words, voices, and images projected onto textile screens embroidered with the aesthetic sense of the women’s stories. The interpellation through this fragmented sensibility imbues the viewer with emotional knowledge rather than offering a detached and linear report.

Viewing Wu’s 1997 video today, Stories of Women from Hsin-Chuang provides a record of the aftermath of Taiwan’s economic boom, as her video captures in hindsight the impact of the factories on the life of the workers who convey the loss of their youth. The experiences of the Taiwanese women connect them to the subjects of Cao Fei’s 2005–6 video project Whose Utopia?, a work that sent Cao to spend six months in the German-run Osram light-bulb factory located in Guangzhou and the Pearl River Delta. Acknowledging China’s economic boom as an outcome of globalization, Cao states that she saw the industrial changes transforming her hometown in the Pearl River area into what is considered as ‘the world’s factory.’ The recurring theme, however, of the migration of workers to China’s factories such as the Osram plant reproduces the déjà vu of young women who leave their homes to support the education of their male relatives in exactly the same way that the women of Hsin-Chuang explained their motives for working in the textile factories during the 1970s. Cao suggests that ‘in traditional families boys are considered to be more important’ and therefore receive the privilege of education.

But overall, Whose Utopia? is politically different from Wu’s expression of Taiwan, as Cao’s video project portrays the irony of China’s capitalist dream after decades of proletarian revolution under Mao. To create her video, Cao enlisted the performances of the Osram workers, much in the way that Mao’s wife, the actress Jiang Qing, staged the workers and soldiers as the subjects of revolutionary operas during the Cultural Revolution. Cao also films them dressed up and dancing on the floor of the warehouse, originally the socialist place of labor. But the new role of the worker looks like a fantasy of capitalist individualism in Cao’s video, in opposition to the very ideals of Mao’s Communist utopia and the dream of equality for the working class. In the post-socialist reality of China, Cao’s fantasy fiction on film, inextricable from the ‘real’ workers staged at the actual Osram factory, challenges the viewer’s engagement with both the cinematic and documentary qualities of the film. Cao illustrates Rancière’s concept of ‘documentary fiction’, which he describes as hailing from a Maoist theatricalization that deploys the ‘fragments of the intermingled history of the cinema.’ Similarly, film theorist Kwai-Cheung Lo uses the term ‘interpellation beyond interpellation’ to define the questionable identities represented in today’s media, and his model of
subjectification derives from the conventional use of Althusser’s theory to explain how film confers an identity.

Environmental crises and labor issues are important feminist subjects – they are matriarchal subjects in the ecofeminist cause. Yuk King Tan depicts these issues in visually arresting ways through video works that focus on the city of Hong Kong. Her 2012 video, *Limits of Visibility*, captures the voluminous landscape of recycling materials located at the Hong Kong harbor but headed for the long barges to be shipped to less-developed countries. Tan’s 2008 video performance titled *Scavenger* was the initial inspiration to *Limits of Visibility*, in which Tan follows the recycling trail of the present-day *Ragpicker*, Lam Po Po, an elderly Chinese woman who hauls cardboard on her trolley cart across the streets of downtown Hong Kong. Her destination is the Sheung Wan weigh station, where she is paid for her labor and where the cardboard ends up in the landscape of recycling at the harbor site of *Limits of Visibility*. On this particular excursion of the *Scavenger*, Tan supplies Lam Po Po with a stack of cardboard that is laser-cut to resemble the bronze lion statues that have guarded the HSBC banks since they were first made for the 1923 inauguration of the Shanghai branch. The performative act in which the elderly Chinese matriarch literally carries the symbol of global capital from the HSBC downtown location to the recycling center represents an ecofeminist disruption of patriarchal power. However, the performance has even greater resonance when viewed from the authority of the Buddhist teaching, the famous *Jin shizi zhang*, the Treatise of the Golden Lion as the original lion symbol in China’s political and philosophical history. The seventh-century teaching was a lesson for Empress Wu presented to her by the Buddhist monk Fazang who explained the laws of the cosmos by using the example of the lion statue in the Empress’s palace to reveal the dharma of material manifestations of gold as a contrast to the concept of *emptiness*. Tan’s paper lion is simply another manifestation of material properties, given value and meaning by the consumer today who must inevitably reconcile with the laws of nature and the pollution of the planet.

The last two chapters of the book, Chapter Four’s ‘The dialectical image of empire’ and Chapter Five’s ‘The archive of Chineseness – the global exposition and the museum’ are studies that pivot to the subject of global expositions in the greater scope of Chineseness in modern history and the geographical consciousness of global capitalism. Through their structural premises, the new proliferation of biennials and triennials associated with global contemporary art can be viewed as a repetition of the principles for art and nation as descendent from the model of the Venice Biennale based on the nineteenth-century world’s fairs. By the late 1890s, fine art palaces had been built for world’s fairs held in metropolitan cities such as Paris and Chicago to extol the heritage of European and American art. The ‘world expo’
was a showcase of industrial nationalism, once described by Benjamin as the ‘universe of commodities,’ the fairs having established the cartographical model for biennials and triennials. The very first exhibition of the fine arts at the Venice Biennale in 1895 was a celebration of the artistic production of European nations, and their pavilions heralded the Western artistic heritage. The organizing principles for displaying art and cultures were deliberated here, at the fairs, and as noted earlier, China’s art was not included in the fine arts in the Venice Biennale until Bonito Oliva invited Chinese artists to the group show in 1993.

Timothy Mitchell in his essay ‘Orientalism and the Exhibitionary Order’ describes the critical components of this ‘new apparatus of representation’ that provided a ‘central place [for] the representation of the non-Western world.’ China’s status as an Oriental culture meant that Chinese artistic production was granted ‘anthropological’ rather than ‘fine-arts’ classification, exemplified by the displays of ‘non-modern’ cultures in the world’s fairs. As investigated in this chapter, the institutionalization of this divide explains why it took a hundred years for the first official pavilion dedicated to the Republic of China on Taiwan to be included in the Venice Biennale in 1995. The Chinese Village at the 1893 Chicago World’s Fair organized by F.W. Putnam from Harvard University, for example, provides an important historical context for understanding the formative divide between the art historical and anthropological staging of cultures. The fairs’ representation of the ‘Oriental’ body had particular pertinence within this exhibitionary context, with significant ramifications for later deployments of the Chinese body. For the colonial displays were extrinsically a part of the world’s fairs, often staged as ‘human showcases’ of native peoples exhibited in their ‘natural’ habitats of huts and primitive architecture. The two types of exhibitions – defined loosely as those displaying culture as art versus those foregrounding culture as ethnography – would establish the binary between Western art history and cultural anthropology. Mitchell goes on to argue that the importance of this powerful system of knowledge in which the non-West was constructed was to serve the ‘manufacture of national identity and imperial purpose’ during the late nineteenth century. This knowledge production would support the cause of explorers such as Sven Hedin and legitimize the anthropological displays of the Beauty of Loulan. The validation of showcasing bodies dug up from graves was given authority by the universities and scientific parties conducting the ethnographical and archaeological study.

Chapter Four provides the theoretical foundation for Chapter Five’s study, acknowledging the significance of the first inclusions of the separate states of China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong in the Venice Biennale between 1993 and 2005. The paradox in which the new global biennials and triennials are considered as the innovative break from the institutional order dividing
Western art history from cultural anthropology can be viewed by the forgotten lineage of the Venice Biennale as the institutional standard for today’s biennials. Its inaugural moment in 1895 for European nations was just two years later than the opening of the Chinese Village at Chicago’s 1893 World’s Columbian Exposition with its display of Chinese ‘artefacts.’ But the twentieth-century management of cultural objects by anthropology museums took up where the worlds’ fairs left off by institutionalizing the displays of huts and habitats representing ‘primitive’ cultures. One of the major reasons why global expositions, biennials, and artfairs appear as ‘new’ global institutions is due in part to the museumifying permanence of objects reflecting the manufacture of the art/ethnography divide. Throughout the twentieth century, it was the museum, not the biennial/triennial, that inscribed the artwork and the artefact according to the categories of the modern and the primitive.

Chapter Five addresses the knowledge production of museums in relation to artfairs by tracing the colonialist provenance of two seventeenth-century Ming vases in the collection of one of the oldest anthropology museums, the Pitt Rivers Museum at Oxford University. The study of these artworks provides a different perspective, one that disrupts the museal norm for looking at Chinese art, since the vases were exportware made in China for the collection of the Rajahs of Sarawak in the Malaysian state of Borneo, where a Chinese and Malaysian population resides to this day. The most celebrated of Chinese art, the Ming vase can be viewed by its status as a work representing diasporic Chineseness. The way in which objects are categorized by nations, culture, or ethnicity in both of the systems of the museum and the artfair proves to be insufficient for the processes for identifying Chinese cultures. Chapter Five situates the vase in the performance of Malaysian rituals in connection to Chinese contexts of diasporic difference. The conceptual work of contemporary Malaysian Chinese artist Wong Hoy Cheong, staged in the Pitt Rivers Museum, provides a contrast to the historical object of Chineseness. But specific to the realm of the museum, the Ming vase is more readily associated with the collector and the art market as the determinant of national or cultural value. For instance, the Chinese vase hailing from the Qing dynasty court that sold at auction in 2010 for 69.5 million dollars was newsworthy for breaking all previous records, raising the stakes for Chinese art.

In 1995, Ai Weiwei presented his performance photograph, *Dropping a Han Dynasty Urn*, not only to reflect the loss of tradition (and the illustrious heritage of the Han in 207 BCE) but also to question the value and worth of art objects. Bodily oriented artists in China such as Ai have recognized the remarkable ability to address artistic traditions, ideals, and the value of human life itself through embodied expressions that can function to perform those traditions and ideals. Chapter Five closes with a study of bodily-oriented works at the Venice Biennale presented between 1993 and
2005, acknowledging the differences in national and cultural representation by Chinese artists representing China, Taiwan, and Hong Kong for the very first time in the Biennale’s hundred-year history. Together, they embody the event of representation, as the global artfair illustrates the metaphorical geography, the ‘cognitive maps’ that Alberto Toscano describes as the varying and recombinant ‘axes of class, race, gender, sexuality and more; they [are] affected by the vicissitudes of praxis.’ Toscano’s study on art and visual culture acknowledges the ‘problem of visualising or narrating capitalism today.’ Since Documenta 11 and director Okwui Enwezor’s groundbreaking effort in 2002 to use the art exposition as a political platform, the artfair event has now been politically effective in re-focusing art toward world issues such as the plight of refugees and the economic conditions of a nation. As discussed in the Postscript in Chapter Four, these issues were important for the development of Documenta 14 as the 2017 artfair was staged in the second site of Athens in addition to its traditional location in Kassel. The political scene for curators and directors of biennials and triennials is usually connected in some way to issues of global capitalism. And as a decolonizing process, the historical premise of the global exposition enables organizers of biennials/triennials to utilize its inherent organizing principles, symbolism, and nationalist signifiers to serve a new political advantage.

In summary, the five chapters of this book define the concept of Chineseness through the study of bodily-oriented artists in video works that function to show the mediation of the gaze in the practice of identification. Among the different explorations in this book, the feminist and ecofeminist positions taken by artists are important to their use of the medium of video performance as a specific form of interpellation – the viewer is implicated in the videos’ reflection of the detriment to the environment made by humans. But the showcase of their expressions in relation to the timeless role of the exhibition enables the use of metaphors in which the ‘staging’ of bodies serves to represent both culture and nation, particularly when staged in the biennials, triennials, and global expositions. The nationalism that exhibitions of cultures function to serve has long contributed to the problem of the over-simplification of difference, which has only increased in the classification of global art as the new movement of contemporary art. The ultimate aim of this book’s close study of the works of Chinese artists from China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, the United States and other diasporic locations is to provide a more specific analysis of the complexity of Chinese artistic expression. Overall, these works are integral to the larger theoretical study of Chineseness and the concentrated examination of ‘geographical consciousness’ in the context of world expositions. In the era of transnational capital, the contemporary work of art can only be understood through the historical structures for staging art, culture, and nation.
Introduction: staging art and Chineseness
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