时间 / 无间
Time
Based...Non-Places
The 3rd Shenzhen Independent Animation Biennale
24 时间的广场
The Square of Time
李振华

26 时间 / 无间
Time Based, Non-Places
李振华

42 动画与媒体艺术，知识与展示
Animation and Media Art, Knowledge & Presentation

44 知识定向
Directed towards Knowledge
邵志飞
Jeffrey Shaw

48 延展动画：一个用文字和图像表述的简短谱系学
Expanded Animation: A Short Genealogy in Text and Images
西格弗里德·奇林斯基
Siegfried Zielinski

66 无地点性的展览
"Non-Places" Exhibition
孙国栋

72 自南准《禅之电影》的美学变化
The Aesthetics of Change in Paik's Zen for Film
汉娜·霍玲
Hanna Hölling

98 延展动画 / 社群连接
Expanded Animation, Socially Engaged

100 "人民城寨" 城市宣言，第二人生计划
Manifesto of RMB CITY, Second Life Project
曹斐

104 关于曹斐的《人民城寨》
Some Notes on Cao Fei's RMB City
侯瀚如
Hou Hanru

106 植物人视听唤醒
Audio-Visual Awakening of Vegetative State
吴超，夏维伦
Wu Chao, Xia Weilun

110 《悬浮》之后，写点什么
Written after Suspending
吴超
Wu Chao

112 老人，小孩，治愈者
The Old, the Young, and the Healer
老人，小孩，治愈者
The Old, the Young, and the Healer
夏维伦
Xia Weilun

114 空间的动画
Animation in Space

120 为什么要在魔兽世界内讨论女权主义？
Why Talk Feminism in World of Warcraft?
安吉拉·瓦连薇
Angela Washko

124 《悬浮》之后，写点什么
Written after Suspending
吴超
Wu Chao

172 人间净土——扩增实境版
Pure Land AR
莎莉·肯德林，邵志飞
Sarah Kenderdine, Jeffrey Shaw

208 特别放映
Special Screening

210 一切都是幻象、也是一面镜子
Everything is an Illusion and a Mirror
李振华

214 回顾：第三届深圳独立动画双年展——特别放映
Review: The 3rd Shenzhen Independent Animation Biennale Special Screening

234 执行策展人小传——卢川
Executive Curator: Lu Chuan
执行策展人小传——卢川
Executive Curator: Lu Chuan
李振华
Li Zhenhua

250 中国独立动画小传
Brief Intro: Chinese Independent Animation

252 动画凶猛——中国独立动画的起跑（演讲修订稿）
Ferocious Animation—
Chinese Independent Animation Takes Off
(Text Revised from Speech)
曹凯
Cao Kai
268 见证奇境——邱炯炯
Witness of an Enchanted land—Qiu Anxiong

276 来自左边的亚洲：中国实验动画的现实个案与历史通像
Asia from the West: A Case Study and the History of Chinese Experimental Animation

293 《刺痛我》工作笔记
Working Notes on PIERCING

302 新旧媒介
Old and New Media

306 续晓春创作自述
Miao Xiaochun: Artist Statement

320 依旧出新：从早期近代通往未来的可能
Discovering The New in The Old: The Early Modern Period as a Possible Window to the Future?

336 你是一块肉：周啸虎作品中的权力与误解：欲望与希望
You are Just a Piece of Meat: Power and Misunderstanding, Desire and Hope in the Work of Zhou Xiaohu

364 生理机械时空的文化螺旋：后人类主义、赛博格与具身性——关于《刺破那个星球》
Cultural Spiral of the Bio-mechanical Age: Cyborg, Posthumanism and Embodiment on Tian Xiaolei’s Solo

366 现实的乌托邦
Realistic Utopia

368 李振华 × 雷磊 对我来说就像一个城堡
Li Zhenhua × Lei Lei: To me it feels like a castle

377 推荐展映
Nominated Screening

451 暴政
Review

452 鬼魂西行：关于第二届深圳独立动画双年展主题展的四则笔记
Dong Bingfeng

462 心灵世界：构建虚拟艺术工程——关于中国独立动画的理论意义
Wang Chunchen

469 被遮蔽的实验——2000年以来中国独立动画的实验之旅
Zhang Xiaotao
“《禅之电影》到底是什么？”2014年，我曾为《复光》中的一篇名为《复光》的文章进行了一次讲座，而在那次讲座中，我则回答了《禅之电影》（1962–1964）。《禅之电影》是1990年代最重要的电影作品，虽然它在今天已经不再重要，但当我们谈论到战国时代的电影和文学作品的时候，我们总是会想起它。虽然它可能已经不如当年的荣耀，但它仍然是我们这个时代的重要标志。

然而，我们又该如何去理解《禅之电影》呢？它究竟是一种怎样的电影？它又是否真的影响了我们今天的电影？在最近的电影中，我们可以看到一些电影的影子，它们似乎继承了《禅之电影》的一些特点。这些电影在形式上和内容上都有着很多相似之处，但它们却也都有着自己的特点。这让我们不得不去重新思考《禅之电影》的意义。

《禅之电影》是1990年代最重要的电影作品，虽然它在今天已经不再重要，但当我们谈论到战国时代的电影和文学作品的时候，我们总是会想起它。虽然它可能已经不如当年的荣耀，但它仍然是我们这个时代的重要标志。

然而，我们又该如何去理解《禅之电影》呢？它究竟是一种怎样的电影？它又是否真的影响了我们今天的电影？在最近的电影中，我们可以看到一些电影的影子，它们似乎继承了《禅之电影》的一些特点。这些电影在形式上和内容上都有着很多相似之处，但它们却也都有着自己的特点。这让我们不得不去重新思考《禅之电影》的意义。

从传统到新概念

在过去很长的一段时间里，艺术理论和哲学理论都是建立在一种静止的、稳定和虚无的概念性理解上的。对于《禅之电影》的阅读和理解，我们经常会被一个理论的框架所束缚，从而忽视了它的本质。然而，如果我们能够从一个新的角度去理解它，我们就会发现它的内在联系和意义。

对《禅之电影》的理解和解读，需要我们从一个新的角度去理解。如果我们能够从一个新的角度去理解它，我们就会发现它的内在联系和意义。
的状态从一个动作转为另一个动作。（赛弗 2007:35），一件艺术品“完成了”，作为1960年代末到1970年代的艺术倾向之一，由学院对“艺术性”作为一件固定实体在有其代表性的作品中表现出来的要素提出了质疑。在学院派出现之后，艺术成为了一个自己动手做的现实，而不是一个自己动手做的物件。功能性而神秘不可侵犯的物件、艺术性作为一件商品以及它社会的载体，这一切都是当时以学院派关联的艺术品所含有的。（即使这个概念在社会概念化的后期再被归位）。从《神之电影》这个例子，我们可以看到艺术成为了正在发生和转折，一件艺术品是处于永恒的无常状态。

艺术品

《神之电影》是一部由白南准于1962至1964年间创作的电影艺术作品。看上去很简单，白南准的助手骑马戴上头盔，杜尚作品是单色的图画，描绘出是一个空旷的16毫米片头通过摄影机在放映。虽然最早只是一个概念，但不是物件的布景安排，这部作品最后的构思是与一件特定的展览物混连在一起。一个电影投影机，投射决定他作品的行为并且产生一种自我投影，而使他成为白色的尘埃、划痕和部分这样的变化在电影中扮演着极其重要的角色。《神之电影》重新定义了关于白南准的创作利用了一部传统和普遍使用的电影片头，以及无处不在的摄影胶片投影机。成就了他这种伟大之作。用的道具越多，指的是放映用的胶片，长期使用导致的磨损代表了本作品自身的存在状态，以及白南准电影媒介在实验性和科幻电影中的想法。

《神之电影》肯定曾问及乔治·麦卡锡（1931–1978）看《我们》，自封为一名名流作家的代表人物和组织力量以及一名电影文化的爱好者，麦卡锡在家庭中教授从人类的自我意识，他将大量的空白胶片片段放置在各个从纽约皇后区大街上到他的那与之相连的带子内里。通过这个举动，来自微波镜的《神之电影》出现了：它确实保留了白南准的最初概念（一部可以放映的电影），但它同时也变成了另一些东西，一部可以收藏的手工艺品。除此之外，白南准还通过了《神之电影》的简单重映，在一部投影机上放映一段空白的片头，这就是他对于电影的解释，在这投影机上，一部空白的片头，他留下的痕迹和不确定的投影时长都被固定了（虽然这并不影响这个新的媒介按照自己的方式出现耗损和变化）。

将《神之电影》调换到微波镜中，然后再被选入《电影选集》，这一切都和麦卡锡有关。他最初的发布会感受到艺术作品的意识形式以及他的左倾政治观念有关。对于麦卡锡而言，艺术创作应该让所有人都能参与并且能触及到并且使用上可用最原始的方式：从一个角度观看，白南准也对佛教禅学的质朴，它对艺术作品在执行上赋予极小重要性以及对物质层次的重视（一件艺术品在艺术家中到现场开始创作以前就已经是一件纯艺术的）感兴趣。《神之电影》的早期身份可能源自它在白南准早期的构思（一部空白的影片在摄影机上放映，转到微卡锡的后来的阐述（《神之电影》成为了微波镜以及溶解胶片选集的一部分）。这个过程不但动

挠了一件静物的观念，并且对单一作品论提出了质疑。而《神之电影》之后的一些转折点同样跟它跟博物馆之间的关系有关。

令人解脱的多样性

《神之电影》早就被多家博物馆纳入收藏，其中包括位于纽约的现代艺术博物馆，巴黎的萨特、波兰杜国家艺术文化中心、美国哈佛艺术博物馆的福建艺术博物馆、明尼亚波利斯的沃尔克艺术中心以及多家其他的博物馆。近来这部艺术作品大多以16毫米的格式进行放映，或以8毫米的格式进行放映，而这应该是源自于对头寸尺寸的错误解读，也有以微波镜头的影片出现。在遗留胶片的形成基础上在现代艺术博物馆的西弗兰微波镜头收藏，还有数字档案形式的版本。互联网网站也可以在YouTube、UbuWeb和Electronic Arts Intermix（EAI）的数字档案库上观看它的数字版本。


乍看之下，白南准影片存在的多样性可以说是没有止境，因此，当这部作品进行的理由，标准的艺术史探寻道路并不足以完全探求它所代表的一切。虽然只是从白南准的遗产和研究者本身收藏这些作品的博物馆和收藏家可以同时展示，我们该如何看待《神之电影》许多外貌上的特征，来自1960年代的胶片，以及最近出现的残余影片？以上提及的作品，它们是否都算是真正的《神之电影》吗？

到底《神之电影》是否可以保留？当作品以投影的方式展出，出借人只是单纯地将作品借给艺廊（展览）的人而没有给予创作者在投影胶片上的任何权利。虽然这可以解释为其实并没有可以保留的事物。如果我们仔细审视1960年代保存至今的电影胶片，它的保存可能是代表了一个惯例的关系，对于、稳定物件的情怀。来自微波镜的《神之电影》可以说有着截然不同的历史，它似乎暗示了与保存者物的意识形态，这些电影自始至终没有放过，它只是单纯地被放置在塑封盒子里。

如果我们不深入探索更多关于《神之电影》本质和行为的问题，它是否可能被保存，也有可能被保留。它到底是不是一件基于艺术作品的本质和材料特性——是否是能被设计的物件——而可被保存的物件？它到底是一个想法，一个概念还是一场演出活动，在一场空白胶片的展览（转为表演意义上的主题被机械地取去），还是一个最近积累和退化的过程？我们对它的判断是根据它过去的状态，还是因着
重新诠释的过程而产生，它是如何受到观念上和形态上的改变？总而言之，这件艺术品是怎么形成和属于哪个时代。

虽然如果我们要在论中解答以上的问题肯定会因为篇幅有限而失败告终，而《禅之电影》就这些问题有更深入的论述。我认为《禅之电影》可定的角色反映了1900年代当时的世代以及是演为上的一个。我主张，我认为《禅之电影》所散发的多样性所造成的困境反映了恒久与无常之间的辩证，而这一切透过对可收藏物质物件的寄托以及保留静止物件的热情得以阐明。

恒久与无常之间的二分法
在考虑艺术家作品的时候部分是因物质性的时间性。在这个领域，我无不避免会想到底怎样的艺术作品是恒常的，物品保存恒久的理想和保护艺术作品一直存在但维护原则却不应过分，但为什么会这样？为什么物件需要被保持恒久不变？恒久与无常的区分到底是从何而来，而我们应该如何利用此二分法去考虑艺术品？

我的假设是此二分法源自把艺术品理解处成在某个时间内，某个时长内的事物，而时间的理解则是对人类世界的持续努力的深入。同样的，这个问题也可能和维护与物质的复杂性有关。作为一名艺术家或一具展览人的生命周期并不足以掌握一件媒介的来龙去脉。因此，这件作品必须被永久保持，或至少能够涵盖人类一生的时长。我个人认为这是一段时间和“可维护”物件意念的源头，这一切也决定了传统的维护理论。

在考虑艺术作品的时间层面就会联想到戈特弗里德·埃夫洛姆，莱斯特对于空间与时间艺术的区分，以及他对媒介的视角和艺术理论。的确，我们之前提出的观点，空间艺术与时间艺术有着相似的视角。艺术品在时空中的表现被保持在动态的，以及媒介的发展是如此发生的被重新组织化的。媒体装置、表演以及与时间体验紧密结合的事件这类艺术作品会发生根本的变化，而艺术装置和雕塑这类较早的艺术作品在时间上的反应则较为被动。它的一般上所使用材料的退化，衰退和老化的现象改变。透过电影的表现，《禅之电影》就是在物质世界上的变化而成为一件对时间发生积极反应的艺术作品。在手工工艺的层面上，装置艺术和电影胶片都感受了时间的流逝，电影胶片上显而易见的演化，标签和塑料套管变的泛黄。

在讨论过上述的例子以及《禅之电影》，我认为与其继续探索恒久和无常的对比，接下来我就是从艺术品作品时中的相对论的角度去重新看待艺术作品。

相对时间的无常
“问题并不是短暂和永恒之间的对比，万物皆不是永恒。关键的问题是无常的相对时长”，这是英国剧场艺术家保尔·布里托尔的观点。按照他的这个观点，可能我们应该回顾恒久和无常的二元论，成为关于改变的美学和属性。对于短期和长期艺术品发生改变视为正常的。

为了阐明我的观点，我想指出由于《禅之电影》曾多次被复制以及与不同观众的互动，它所包含的二分法和艺术活动的周期性，是深深植根于艺术和电影的。

艺术作品的活动，表演和过程经常需要有文本的稳定；配乐、指引导、剧本、见证和表现。虽然我们没有依据证明剪接师曾经受过“禅之电影”的指引导，但它意指可能散布在思想上的艺术活动。它也包含了观众的参与，例如参加现代美术馆的交流活动。

艺术作品的活动，表演和过程同时也产生了大量与时间流逝产生对立或副产品的形式，例如它的“死亡”和“一般”。任何形式的记录（例如、照片和文字）道具、剧本和表演剧本等都填补了活动本身缺乏的信息，确保了有形、可读和可见的关系的。在这个过程中，一切美学皆可能被更完全的现时所取代，而产生那一种转变到一定的程度作品而“消失”了。这种转变产生了一种新的保留和收藏的冲动，从而扩大了艺术品作品的所有积聚，例如布尔乔伊的蝴蝶学理论一样针对物件产生的情绪反应，上述对于收藏的欲望是永无止息的。从表演理论的语境来看，作家和策展人克里斯托弗·维延福特称这种现象为“表层的病毒”将之延伸到雕塑历史（从理论上去延伸到无穷大）以及在多个不同文体将表面重新画造。

记录同样按照这种理论。在没有活动的情况下，一个富有多层结构的记录证明了存在的作品。例如对罗兰·巴尔德斯而言，一部电影的精确保留存在的原始剧本。对于艺术理论家如萨德来说，一场真实的现场表演的纪录可能是一张照片、影像、录音和描述。虽然这些电影和表演的载体是否存在无从确定，对于他们对历史的关注是可以被我们理解它们对文本作品的本质。在这部”《禅之电影》作为对禅之电影”的形式，可以被看作是在1960年代美国的美学的剩余物和记录。文件的标题意指，它转移到麦金斯镇上的形象，将这些图像连成一套片的资讯，而且永远做不到不清晰和完整。

从时间的角度来看，《禅之电影》可以被看成一场表演，而电影则提供了对演出的观众欣赏。由麦克卢汉体会在一部影片中的观众，从而产生一个表演出来的瞬间。这个表演被影片的循环播放再现的戏剧，是一个时间和具放射性的存在。为了使它产生清晰的了解只能依靠碎片化的资讯，而且永远做不到不清晰和完整。
按照维克的永恒逻辑，我们可以保留《神之电影》在现时的余暇吗？太多的剩馀物可能会破坏了遗留影片的价值，而商品的价值本是无与伦比以及独一无二的可收藏品。在这部分与后人对话的过程中，曾有前人建议保留某些未进行新安装的影片在使用过的电影幻灯片，我对这个建议感到惊奇。如果真的实施这个建议，难道不将现代艺术博物馆对手上现有的遗留影片拥有特殊的权利？

很明显，这样的想法自《神之电影》失去其概念潜在的无限延申能力。根据德克·皮特金有关于艺术作品本质的例子理论，透过实现一个概念（也可以是来自一个符号或者是一个模型）产生的物品仅仅只是例子，而不是最后的成品。这些尝试印制《神之电影》开放性的做法（不但针对作品最初的构思，也对微波炉开罐所导致的复制）可以理解为对艺术作品符号经济的干预。这种做法倾向于支持商品化的消费，但剥夺了《神之电影》开放的商业化过程以及它的不稳定性。

更多艺术作品的时间相关论的后果

"现存物，尊重物件"。这是美国艺术家克利斯·奥里登曾提出的PFF的定义，指的是在表演结束后被选中的物件。他的观点是："现存物是在表演和重演表演过程中产生的、表演主角，但当它结束后，会产生一些图腾的物件，它们可能是单一的，纪念品或是剩余物。"这些剩余物的承若的回忆和历史有可能今在重现。最重要的它们可以和照传统"西方"博物馆的标准来收藏和保留物件。除此之外，如果艺术作品本身的功能是作为可收藏的物件但成为了遗物，"神之电影"的遗物反应就是例子之一，由市场经济主导的商品化过程强化了维护"保护"者和"破坏"者的做法。博物馆化的过程对英雄做出了相反的负面影响，博物馆化的过程对收藏品可以是保存古物。

现在，随着艺术作品的时间相关论去考虑，可能会出现很有意思的结果。如果我们能够将艺术作品是一个物件的假设，我们可以去到到底是所有的艺术作品其实都有时间的，它们就是技术和活动的表演、表演的过程、利用同样的逻辑，传统的油画或雕塑则被视为较长较短的艺术作品，这可能赋予物体的保存功能，以及收藏物和博物馆方面的价值，但我们可以看出在一般的二元论中会变得异常，对于我们如何透过旧日的"稳定"物件的想法去掌握"新"的本体（多媒体、演出、活动）也产生了许多问题。

我提出的问题也可能会产生另一个影响，我们可以透过"新"的角度去寻找传统的艺术作品。从传统角度来看，它们可能会被看作是一件需要不少关注的新颖事物。在传统中并不很常见，演出或是活动都有着被享用的时间存在，但不代表它们程式化了和动化了。另外，一件艺术作品产出的物件数量可能会跟其存在时间成正比。换句话说，艺术作品越被忽视，它可能会更有生命力产生更多的在博物馆化和商品化的过程中，为了回应得到有形物件的冲动，那些剩余物、道具、遗留物、影片和电影纪录反而可能获得艺术品的身份。当然，这些物件可以"永恒保存"，符合传统唯物主义者的态度。

这不但代表较长时间的艺术作品无法制造现场，事实上相反，较长时间作品产出的纪录无法与表演所累积的纪录和剩余物相提并论。较长时间作品可以产生很多，它们从体裁的多样性丰富度，到成为艺术品的潜力都无法与较短时间的作品相比较。

可是传统物件有可能是和表演产出的剩余物和剩余物呢？可以"稳定物件"本身就是自身的剩余物和剩余物，根据自身的环境和过往的介入的"社会"和"社会感染"。知名艺术家的作品可能会被视为概念，例如商店使用5美元购买没有署名的画或许只是被视为一场不被欣赏的交易的剩余物。

活动之后，或是还剩下什么

对《神之电影》作为一个表演进行媒介的表现而言，后悔大抵是对我哲学家大卫-赛维斯的一次回复："艺术理论的"对"和"错"的区别，一般而言，这个经历非常奇特的区域在使用语言艺术学如音乐和影像，可将象征的形式定义为普遍类型（四元体印刷的）的操作与实践。其质量在格雷戈里，对一定单个和多层艺术之间差异的视同性（即德曼的符号理论是这种差异的例子之一），赛维斯大胆地改变了他们的理论并在指所指的"艺术作品是什么"象征的活动，而不是类型活动。有哲学家，1980年代艺术发展的一些事件是不值得额外去指的理论最真，对于赛维斯来说真正的正是工作，艺术作品通过一系列的行动去完成他的工作，关注并不只是最后的成就。赛维斯曾为演出表演的建筑是一件可以让我们欣赏艺术家成就的"集体的欣赏"。它代表了艺术家的作品和表现。艺术理论中决定了一件作品：勿有分析推测。

我认为对一件艺术作品的意义和价值而言，对于不同群体的观察艺术作品创作的模式，换言之，它们怎么样，对于识别艺术作品的状态也可以对观察艺术作品创作的成果，一件艺术作品的成果是在艺术作品"发生"之后的现象（如亚里士多德的观点），重要的是去到表明艺术作品二维或三维的创作，这个词汇非常重要，因为我们需要一个并可以涉足的材料。所以我想我不必去讨论这些，不再想象过去发生的事物，而是提出理论的假设可以是和实际的现实，我感兴趣的理论是各个现象特征，以及光是创作的过程对被我们提供关于艺术作品是什么的定义（这通常就会涉及到艺术），其质重新演绎，扩展的脉络学，实现和转移——衰退、分辨和退化。我提出的理论可以作为在类型理论的建构，和卡里和赛维斯对艺术作品为表达的理论不同，我关注的是剩下的东西；剩余物、剩余物、道具、剩余物和剩余物等。因此，虽然两个群体都关注创作艺术作品创作的时间，我的理论主要关注一种研究艺术作品的形式，而这个形式关注的不是艺术作品的如何和何时创造，而是创作完成之后剩下什么。剩下的东西我称之为"反抗"。这也是我对形式的构成，因此，从产品——艺术（传统艺术作品）转移到过程——艺术（1960年代的转移）和理论出现（现代艺术作品）暗示了现在关注的是剩下的。
维护作为短暂介入

总而言之，在后凯奇时代的艺术作品如《禅之电影》所发生的改变不但反映了艺术概念的总体改变，艺术可以是什么（涉及至本体论的问题）——而我只是碰到了这个谜团的表面而已——同时也引起了对于它们的展示和延续性在思维上的改变。如果我们严峻地考量在维护和策展方面的规律，撇开它的理论上的含义，摆脱传统对物件与短暂物件的二元论将让我们从解决这些矛盾的冲突中解放出来。

与其不断尝试阻止改变，将自身放在执行不可能的任务中，我们可以对所有种类的艺术作品看作不断改变和演化的实体，它们持续发生物质上的变化和流变。

同样的，策展和维护可以被视为对这些艺术品的短暂介入，其赋予其新的潜能（有此神秘地使艺术作品回复到它的“最原始状态”）。

维护的工作可以在符合档案盒的允许和/或限制下对有短暂的多个艺术品加入变化。

视手维护的文化，应该由档案去制定规则和就什么可以说或做设定限制，同时参考现在和过去。

与其指出表演理论对于这项研究过于激烈，我认为它其实提供了机会从长时的角度去重新思考传统艺术作品。这有可能会揭示一些由于已久理念的缺陷，而这也有可能让我们摒弃一直以来对物件稳定性的坚信不疑，并导致我们总是对改变持负面的看法。

在这里呈现的策展和维护的想法都是希望大家能够接受这些媒介的改变和无常为可能存在的状态。诚如杰克·格拉迪尼在唐·德里罗的《白色噪音》里所说的：

“死亡已经在我的身体里，问题是我是否能够活的比他长。”
"What is Zen for Film?" I was asked sometime in the early fall of 2014, on the occasion of a preparatory meeting for Revisions, an exhibition to feature Zen for Film (1962–64), Nam June Paik's "blank" film projection. Despite the many discussions that preceded the meeting, when it came to the question of what the main—and the only—artwork of this exhibition was, we felt as if we'd been left in the dark.

Curatorial engagements are not always simple. Only sometimes might they involve the pleasing task of assembling exhibitions from objects that tell fascinating stories. But the act of exhibiting may also fill the space with the vastness of a philosophical challenge, as in the case of Zen for Film. The gesture of exposing an artwork to the gaze of the viewer can pose arduous questions—questions with which one struggles without any hope of enlightenment and to which answers are always partial and imperfect. What, then, is Zen for Film? If no one asks me, I know what it is. If I wish to explain it to someone else, to paraphrase Saint Augustine, I do not know.

Is Zen for Film an object to be respected as an artifact and for its material idiosyncrasies—an object/multiple or an object/relief? Is it an idea, a concept—or rather, an event, a performance, or a process? How has what it is been determined by what it once was—or what it has become in the process of reinterpretation? How has it been affected by conceptual and physical change? All in all, what, how, and when is the artwork?

Revisions—Zen for Film, a book published by Bard Graduate Center, New York and University of Chicago Press in September 2015 is an exploration of all of these questions. Zen for Film, also known as Fluxfilm NO. 1, is one of the most evocative works by Korean-American artists Nam June Paik. Created during the early 1960s, this piece consists of a screening of blank film, as the film ages and wears in the projector, the viewer is confronted with a constantly evolving work. Because of this mutability, the project, as I show, undermines any assumption that art can be subject to a single interpretation.

Featuring Zen for Film as its main character, this book sets out to challenge a number of assumptions about Zen for Film from the perspective of its presentation, archivization, and continuation. From such a multifocal stance, and with potential consequences for analogous artworks, Revisions addresses what is at stake when it comes to the artwork's presentation—an act shaping not only the (relatively) momentary event of exhibiting objects but also the way in which artworks may be perceived, remembered, and reactivated in the future. Inquiring into the modes of an artwork's existence, Revisions observes how technological obsolescence and reinterpretation frame the work's identity. Particularly with respect to recurring installations that undergo the process of de- and re-assembly, such as Zen for Film, questions regarding its institutionalization, display, and distribution become the ones that affect its existence. In the case of iterated artworks, care for the future, a mission long assigned to conservation, is clearly inseparable from the question of curation; reciprocally, curation cannot avoid challenges posed by questions concerning conservation. Conservation, then, like its "object," becomes something else—it considers the continuity of artworks on both a conceptual and a material level rather than fostering attachment exclusively to the material object.

In what follows, I offer a few paragraphs from Revisions—Zen for Film that accompanied an eponymously titled exhibition organized at the Bard Graduate Center Gallery in New York (September 17, 2015—February 22, 2016). Fragments of this essay were also published in my article "The Aesthetics of Change" and on the website of the project Media in the Expanded Field.

***

You say: the real, the world as it is. But it is not, it becomes! It moves, it changes! It doesn't wait for us to change... It is more mobile than you can imagine. You are getting closer to this reality when you say it 'presents itself'; that means that it is not there, existing as an object. The world, the real is not an object. It is a process (Care 1981:80).

With these words, John Cage, one of the most influential avant-garde composers, music theorists, writers and artists of the 20th century, reminds us of the change that the psychophysical world undergoes. This change opposes the fixity and self-containment of objects and artworks—an issue too often neglected, especially when we analyze the expanded field of conservation, including presentation and curatorial practices. Too often, these practices assume a certain fixity of objects or even strive to accomplish it.

In this paper, I propose to revisit some implicit and explicit concepts in art and conservation theories that contributed to a notion of a static object with a particular emphasis on the materiality of Nam June Paik's filmic work Zen for Film (1962–64), also known as Fluxfilm NO. 1. Fluxus is a particularly fruitful terrain for my query essentially due to its precursory role in the development of performance art, its questioning of the status of the object and its focus on the idea of temporality and duration.

From traditional to new conceptions

For some considerable time, both art and conservation theories were oriented towards a static, stable, unique and authentic object. In conservation discourse and practice, such an understanding of an object was bound with traditional approaches established in the context of the restoration of artworks conceived of as unique things, often in a single medium, embodying an (individual) authorial intention. Because the goal of traditional conservation was to render 'objects' stable, change was charged with negative qualities, so it was often to be concealed and/or arrested. This also had an
impact on the notion of time implicit in thinking about the conservation of artworks. Associated with a negative aspect of change, time was smoking the picture (William Hogarth), often related to the negative effects of yellowing, cracking and fading of painted layers. Paradoxes of the ideas about time and their relation to the status of objects resulted in attempts to return the perevious, 'intended' condition of an object following — and at the same time subverting — the linear conception of time (Holling 2013: 157). With the introduction of changeable artworks sometime from the middle of the last century, conservation theories gradually began to shift. New thinking in this field began to be marked by the dichotomy of the enduring and the ephemeral — two different conditions of art to be conceptualised and treated differently.

Until the transformation in the understanding of artworks created since the late 1950s brought about different conceptions of what art might be, art theoretical discourse, too, revolved around the questionable term of a static art object (Merewether and Potts 2010: 5; Heubach 1970). Since the late 1950s, artworks have gradually become associated with action, performance, happening and event. "Art" is an artwork not as long as it endures, but when it happens, claimed German art theorist Friedrich Wolfram Heubach (1970). The idea of duration and temporality ruptured art-historical narratives and effectuated a certain detour in the understanding of the art object, formulated in the criticism of that time, notably in relation to painting. American critic Harold Rosenberg sought to understand a painting in terms of the transformation of its artfactual 'thingness' to the act of painting itself (Rosenberg 1952). The event of the painting resulted in the physical evidence of a completed set of actions. In his writings, following Rosenberg and with reference to Jackson Pollock, Allan Kaprow approached Pollock's paintings in terms of concluded happenings (Kaprow 2003 [1958]). A painting was 'happening' now (shifting its status from regard to a verb) (McLuire 2007: 14), and an artwork 'worked'. As one of the most versatile artistic tendencies of the 1960s, Fluxus, too, radically questioned the status of the 'art object' as both a representation and as a static entity, Art, since Fluxus, has become a do-it-yourself — but rather than a do-it-yourself object, a do-it-yourself reality. The functional, sacrificial object, an art object as a commodity and as a vehicle of its own history, was rejected by artists associated with Fluxus (which did not prevent it from returning in the later phase of the commodification of performances). Instead, and as we shall see in the example of Zen for Film, art became that which happens and transitions — an artwork in the state of permanent impermanence.

The artwork(s)

In one of its many incarnations, Zen for Film is a filmic artwork created by Paik sometime between 1962 and 1964 (Fig.1). In its simplicity, Paik’s creative act assumed a Duchampian gesture of a readymade: what the work constituted was a blank 16 mm film leader run through a projector. Although functioning as a concept rather than a physical arrangement of things, the work, as originally conceived, was bound to a specific display apparatus, a film projector. The projector determined the behavior of the work and resulted in a visual performance in which change — the accumulated dust, scratches and marks — played a considerable role. Zen for Film leans on the aesthetics of bricolage: Paik’s creative gesture rendered a conventionally used film leader, a material widely available, and an ubiquitously present analogue film projector, his filmic opus magnum. The more used the better — the film, worn, used and stressed, was to represent the material condition of its own existence, as well as Paik’s thinking with and through the medium of film in the vein of experimental and structural cinema.

Zen for Film must have fascinated George Maciunas (1931 - 1978), a self-proclaimed Fluxus impresario and organizational force as well as an enthusiast of film culture. Producing unlimited homemade Fluxus editions, Fluxikits, Maciunas encased various lengths of a blank film leader in several plastic boxes acquired in Canal Street in New York. Through this gesture, Zen for Film from Fluxus emerged: it indeed retained Paik’s initial concept (a potentially projectable film), but it also became something else — a collectable artifact (Fig. 2). Additionally, Maciunas also transposed Zen for Film’s simple logic — a leader that runs through a projector with no determination of duration — into a determined duration of a Fluxfilm program. One of them, Fluxfilm Anthology (1962 - 1970), comprises some 37 Fluxfilms by artists including George Brecht, Dick Higgins, Yoko Ono and Wolf Vostell. Zen for Film opens the compilation with a title sequence: "Zen for Film Fluxfilm No.1. Nam June Paik." In this film, the processual character of the artwork, its trace accumulation and the undetermined duration of projection became fixed (which did not prevent the new medium from being worn and stressed in its own manner).

The transposition of Zen for Film to its Fluxkit variant and to Film Anthology effectuated from Maciunas’ ideology of economic distribution of Fluxus artworks reassured by his leftist political attitude. Art making, according to Maciunas, should be available to everybody and should use the simplest means available. From another perspective, Paik, too, was interested in simplicity derived from Zen Buddhism and its assignment of minimal importance to the execution of artworks as well as an emphasis on the nature of materials (an artwork is already a work of natural art before the arrival of the artist on the scene). The identity of the early Zen for Film might be located in its transition from Paik’s initial idea (a blank film run on a projector) to Maciunas’ later interpretations (Zen for Film as a Fluxkit and as a part of Fluxfilm Anthology) which not only destabilizes the concept of a static object, but also questions the notion of singular authorship. Later transitions of Zen for Film, however, have to be entirely attributed to the artwork’s museological life.

The troubling multiplicity

Zen for Film has entered numerous collections such as the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) in New York, Centre Georges Pompidou in Paris, Harvard Art Museums/the Fogg Art Museum in Cambridge and the Walker Art Center in Minneapolis, among
many others. Increasingly, the artwork has been displayed as a 16 mm projection, as a 8 mm projection (most certainly) a result of erroneous interpretation of the film leader’s dimension, as a film from Fluxkit, as a film relic from the 1960s enclosed in a film can and housed by the MoMA Silverman Fluxus Collection (Fig. 3), and as a digital file. The work can also be viewed and is known to the majority of the Internet users in its digital form on YouTube, UbuWeb and until recently, it was also available through the Electronic Arts Intermix (EAi) digital database.

In the course of my research, Zen for Film materialized in many variants and variations. For instance, the Guggenheim Museum in New York presented Zen for Film as a projection together with the 1960s filmic relic (The Third Mind: American Artists Contemplate Asia, 1860–1989. 30 January – 19 April 2009), while Tate Liverpool displayed a digital file extracted from Fluxkit Anthology (Nam June Paik: Video Artist, Performance Artist, Composer and Visionary. 17 December 2010 – 13 March 2011; MoMA displayed Zen for Film as a looped 16 mm film projection (There Will Never Be Silence: Scoring John Cage’s 3’34”, 12 October 2013 – 22 June 2014) and has only recently discouraged to present the filmic relic vis-à-vis the projection. Often the viewer encounters in the gallery only the Fluxkit version of the work, which represents the idea of a collectable but lacks the cinematic representation of Paik’s idea.

There is, it seems, no limitation to the multiplicity of existence of Paik’s filmic work. This is also the reason why, when it comes to the moment of its exhibition, the standard art-historical line of inquiry might not be sufficient to account for what is at stake. Although obtaining permissions (either from Paik’s Estate and/or from one of the museums) seems to be a sufficient condition to project the work, how about Zen for Film’s many physical variants, the relic of the 1960s and the filmic residues produced more recently? Are all these works, indeed, Zen for Film?

Is Zen for Film conservable? When the work is displayed as a projection, nothing changes hands between the borrower and the lender but the instruction (the borrower is responsible for an arrangement of both the projection and the film leader). Therefore, it could be said that there is indeed nothing to be preserved. But if we examine more closely the idea of retaining the filmic relic from the 1960s, its preservation might signal an attachment to the physical trace — to the conservation of the tangible, stable object. Having a different history, Zen for Film from Fluxkits also seems to satisfy conservation’s materialist ideology in that these films are never projected, but are kept encased in a plastic box.

Zen for Film is neither exhibitable nor conservable without asking more profound questions concerning its nature and behavior. Is Zen for Film an object to be respected for its artifactual nature and material idiosyncrasies — an object-multiple or an object-relic? Is it an idea, a concept, or, rather, a cinematic event, a performance of the blank film (where the role of the body known from traditional performance is taken over by the apparatus), or a process of trace accumulation and degradation? How has what it is been determined by what it once was, or what it has become in the process of reinterpretation, affected by conceptual and physical change? All in all, what, how and when is the artwork?

Although attempts to give answers to each of these questions in this paper would necessarily fail due to the spatial constraints, and Revisions—Zen for Film (Holling 2015) elaborates on them more extensively, in the following, I argue that Zen for Film’s changeable character reflects the temporal turn of the 1960s and performance-oriented interests. I also propose that the dilemma posed by the multiplicity of Zen for Film’s potential presentations reflects the dialectic of permanence and impermanence, explicating in the attachment to the physical, collectable object and in the zeal to preserve static things.

The dichotomy of the permanent and the impermanent

Thinking about artworks can never be divorced from the temporal aspects of materiality. In this context, I cannot help but wonder what it means that something, an artwork, is impermanent. The ideal of permanence of things and interests in securing the existence of artworks in the future bound with the notion of timelessness is an underlying principle of conservation. But what is the reason for this? Why do objects have to be rendered permanent? Where does the division between the permanent and impermanent come from, and how can we conceive of artworks in relation to this dichotomy?

I hypothesize that this dichotomy is evoked by the problem of the understanding of artworks as being in time, in duration, and has something to do with the understanding of time in terms of endurance as cut to the human dimension. Likewise, this problem might also relate to the fact that in conservation and museum practice, the life of a conservator or a curator is too short to grasp the temporal passing of a masterpiece, which is therefore conceived — and has to be conserved — to endure forever, or at least for an ‘ever’ of a human temporal dimension. This is precisely, I would argue, what elicits the idea of a stable, ‘conservable’ object and what determines traditional theories of conservation.

The consideration of the temporal aspect of artworks evokes Gotthold Ephraim Lessing’s division between spatial and temporal art and its critique in media and art theories (Lessing 1853). As I argued in Re:Paik (Holling 2013: 188-190), spatial art has similar qualities to temporal art, and might be viewed as slow rather than fast. Such a temporal definition of a medium allows us to identify its active and passive response to time, and differentiation in the ways media undergo change. Artworks such as media installations, performance and events actively involved with time experience faster change; slower artworks such as painting and sculpture passively respond to time, which becomes reflected in the degradation, decay and ageing of their physical
Barthes the essence of film resides in film stills (Barthes 1970),11 for art theorist Sven Lütticken, the essence of true live performance might be seen in photos, films, video and descriptions (Lütticken 2005: 24). Whether or not the existence of such essence in film and performance can be claimed, focused attention paid to their extended residual history is highly relevant for the understanding of the nature of their sources. Here, the Fluxfilm Anthology variant of Zen for Film might be seen as both a residue and a documentation of the projection of the 1960s bearing evidence of its material condition at the moment it was transposed by Macunis.12

In a sort of genealogical interdependence, in which facsimiles of documents build upon documents and which, in turn, build upon documents that become artworks themselves,13 such stratigraphy of documentation may never cease to expand, continually depositing new layers on the already accumulated sediment. New interpretations, technologies, cultures of actualization (permitting certain things while restricting others), and multiple locations in which the work exists or is reinterpreted render the achievement of the totality of an artwork’s archive an illusion. The subsequent interpretation will therefore only rely on fragmented information and will be never unbiased, complete.

From the temporal perspective, then, Zen for Film might be conceived of as a performance of sorts, in which the action is enacted by the projector and witnessed by the audience. The mechanical embodiment consists of an apparatus that runs a blank film and results in a projected-upon vertical surface. What remains of this performance is film loops endowed with trace, a temporal marker and reference to the many hours of labour, individual objects to be appreciated for their evidential quality. Dependent on the status of the projection, and contingent on value judgments regarding what might receive permission to enter the archive (whether it is deemed valuable, historical or worthless), the residues of this performance — the used films — are ‘conservable’ and might be preserved. Potentially, they may, just like the early film and the boxed Fluxkit editions, become a signifier of times long passed — fossilised filmic artefacts — relics cherished for their link to the past, but also precisely for this reason condemned never again to see the light of the projector.

Following the perpetual logic of preservation, can we keep the residues of Zen for Film’s current projections? Too many leftovers may possibly relativise the value of the relic that resists not only in its singularity as an element of the historical projection, but also in the commodity value that it acquires as a non-replicable, unique and fetishised collectable. During numerous conversations with curators, a suggestion to oblige borrowers to destroy used filmstrips produced in the course of the works’ reinstallations surprised me. If such suggestions have to be followed, would it not allow MoMA to claim a certain exclusivity of its relic?

Clearly, such practice would disable the potential limitlessness of Zen for Film’s existence implied in its concept. Rather than being final products, according to Dick...
Higgins' theory of an examplicist nature of artwork (Higgins 1978: 156), the objects resulting from the realisation of such a concept (but also from a notion or a model) are only examples. The practice of imposing limitations on Zen for Film's open character (which not only pertains to the openness of the initial concept but is also specific to Fluxus' open-ended, mass-produced editions) might be understood as an intervention in the symbolic economy of artworks. This practice leads towards a consumption of commodified products and is deprived of the open, active and social process involved in contingencies and instabilities of Zen for Film.

More consequences of artworks' temporal relativity

'Love objects, respect objects', pleads American artist Claes Oldenburg referencing the creative act of selection and care for what is picked up after the performance (Oldenburg 1995 [1962]). He continues: 'Residual objects are created in the course of making the performance and during repeated performances. The performance is the main thing, but when it's over there are a number of subordinate pieces, which might be isolated, souvenirs, or residual objects. These residual previously 'acted' or 'domesticated' objects bear memory and a history that might unfold in the present (Brignone 2009: 67). They also, most importantly, fulfill the desire to stabilise and preserve objects in accordance with traditional (Western) museological standards. Moreover, if works were not meant to function as collectable objects, but became such - Zen for Film's filmic relic being an example - the processes of commodification dictated by market economies reinforce conservation and 'conservationalist' gestures. The process of musealisation counters disappearance. The wish to cure grief and nostalgia with the fetish of an object is, indeed, deeply rooted.

Now, the implications of thinking along the lines of artworks' temporal relativity may have fascinating consequences. If one inverts the standard assumption of an artwork as an object, a question might be posed as to whether or not all artworks might be conceived of as temporal entities, either long or short events, performances or processes. Accordingly, traditional paintings or sculptures would become long-durational artworks. This may also invert conventional thinking in conservation and curatorial and museum practice. Not only could the dichotomy of 'the ephemeral' versus 'the permanent' be revoked, but also the problem of grappling with the nature of the 'new' (multimedia, performance, event) through the lens of deeply rooted ideas about the old, 'stable' object.

Perhaps also, as one more consequence of my proposition, traditional artworks could be approached through the lens of the 'new'. Seen from the conservation perspective, it seems to be a novelty that requires some attention, not pursuable here. Performances or events have a compressed temporal presence, but are no less material. Moreover, the number of materials produced by the artwork might be seen as inversely proportional to its endurance in time. In other words, the 'sooner' the artwork disappears, and perhaps the more intensive it is, the more it produces. In the process of musealisation and commodification, and in response to the urge to secure tangible things, leftovers, props, relics, video and film documentation may even acquire the status of artworks themselves. These things, of course, might be kept 'forever', satisfying the traditional materialist attitude.

That is not to say that long-durational artworks fail to produce documentation - quite the contrary. Notwithstanding, as seen in proportion to their duration, the documentation in long-durational works seems to be incomparable with the amassment of documentation and residual objects produced by performance. There is a lot in long-durational objects, which are never as varied and rich in genre and quantity and in potential to become artworks as in the case of short-durational works.

But what could be analogous to the performance's relics and leftovers in the case of traditional objects? Perhaps, in a sense, the 'stable object' is its own relic and remnant, accumulating stratigraphic strata of its own making and all past interventions (cleaning, retouching, etc.). While works by acclaimed artists would hold the position of the relic, the unsigned painting bought at the Housing Works Thrift Shop for 5 dollars might be conceived of as a leftover of an unappreciated performance.

After the event, or what remains

The way of conceptualisation of Zen for Film as performance recalls the aesthetic theories of philosopher David Davies (2004). The type-theory stems from C.S. Peirce's semantic distinctions between the senses of the words 'type' and 'token' (Peirce 1900). Generally speaking, this much-debated distinction applies to the multiple arts such as music and photography, and characterises tokens as instantiating the universal type (prints of a photograph, performances of a musical work). Building on Gregory Currie's suspension of the distinction between the singular and multiple arts (Goodman's theory of symbols being an example of this distinction), Davies offers a twist on his theory by claiming that all artworks are token-events rather than type-events (Rohrbough 2005 [2002]). Interestingly, coinciding with the temporal turn in the arts of the 1960s and its theoretical underpinnings discussed earlier, for Davies, the real work is the process, a series of actions by which the artist arrives at his product and not the product itself. According to Davies, the painted canvas is a 'focus of appreciation' through which we appreciate the artist's achievement and which embodies the artist's idea and work. Kinds of foci determine physical objects; some require analysing the enactment (Davies 2004).

I believe that the idea of an artwork identified by the sort of creative action undertaken by an artist is very interesting. However, if approached from a reversed perspective, this theory might indeed be taken further. If careful attention is paid to the modes of artworks' creation - in other words, how they came into being - the conditions for identifications of artworks might equally be provided by the observation of the afterlives of artworks. An artwork's afterlife concerns the time after the work 'happened'
(in Heubach’s sense), important to identify what and how the artwork is. This realisation is highly important because it is the only reality to which we have access. So instead of retroactively identifying, not to say imagining, the past, the proposed theory insists on looking at the present: it is not exclusively the process of creation that provides information on what these works are (which always involves guesswork), but the re-enactment, expanded trace history, actualisation and also transition – decay, disintegration and degradation. My proposition falls within the type-theoretic proposal, but unlike Currie and Davies’ theory of works as performances, it focuses instead on what is left: the object, leftovers, props, residues, documentation, etc. Thus, although both theories concern the question of when the artwork is, my proposal focuses on a mode of studying artworks that shifts from how and when art was created, to what is left from the creative act, what became of it in the present – the only reality given and point of access to the work. Consequently, the shift from product-art (traditional artworks) to process-art (artworks after the temporal turn in the sense of both the 1960s temporal shift and the temporal theories proposed) implies the concerns with that which remains.19

Duration and intensity

Further it follows that artworks might be identified in relation to their temporal characteristics: they might all be understood as durational, yet distinct. Events endure differently from performances, whereby the defining parameters here are duration and intensity.20 Albeit subject to relativity judgment, the duration and intensity distinguishes the event from performance, from process, from object, and overcomes the dichotomy of two categories of artworks – the permanent and the impermanent.

In fact, Zen for Film presents us with an entire variety of temporal durations. Although, as I stressed, the distinctions between these categories are relative: if Paik’s film is conceptualised within a particular context, it might be grasped as an event (in the sense of a non-repeatable, cinematic event), performance (in the sense of the performed spectacle and dependent on the length of viewer’s engagement), process (in the sense of accumulating traces throughout the totality of the time in which it is projected) and object (in the sense of apparatus, filmic props, Fluxfilms and filmic remnant-relic).

The strategies of continuation of artworks such as Zen for Film reflect the way in which they are conceived. Against the historical ban on reproduction (Phelan 1993: 3), performance might be re-enacted and process redone. Despite the singularity and irreducibility of the qualities of experience of an event, there is a recognition that the event will be repeated, too, albeit differently (Heathfield 2013: 31). The system of recurring iterations always involves deferral and difference. However, the ‘technique of repetition’ does not apply to artworks as physical objects. Not compliant with the ruling museological and conservation culture, such re-doing of an object will always be classified as a copy, or, in more derogatory terms, a forgery, depending on valency, rules and legislation. And yet, in an ongoing aoria of existential diversity, do performance, event and process not result in ‘objects-origins’? (See Zen for Film’s relic.)

Autochronic and allochronic works

Forgery recalls the Goodman distinctions between forgeable/autochronic and unforgeable/allochronic arts (Goodman 1976). Generally, it could be assumed that allochronic arts are characterized by short duration and autographic works by long duration. Here, in order to stress the temporal dimension of my argument and draw attention to another of its aspects, I would like to replace autographicity and autographic with the neologisms of allochronicity and autochronicity, respectively. I owe this terminology to the theorist and composer Michael Century,21 who employs it in relation to the specificity of scores.22 Re-proposing Century’s terms in the context of the temporal relativity of artworks, I propose that the allochronic might refer to artworks untethered to a specific temporality and re-performable, while the autochronic might designate artworks that have a specific, fixed relation to time. Autochronic artworks are something hitherto designated as long-duration, quasi “stable objects,” while allochronic artworks may recur in instances of their repeated iterations.

Zen for Film’s relic would thus assume the character of an autochronic entity, while Zen for Film projection, an allochronic one. Again, this distinction is only viable in the context of the Western traditional museological (and conservation culture), in which the replication of the long-durational artwork is not accepted as a valid strategy of its continuation. Staying close in its relationship to the token-theory by denying the divide between the multiple and singular artworks, autochronicity and allochronicity assure both the artwork’s location in a temporal structure and its temporal identity.

Conservation as temporal intervention

In sum, the transformation in artworks created in the post-Cagean era such as Zen for Film reflects not only a general change in the concept of art, what art can be (a question of ontological nature) – and have only scratched the surface of this puzzle – but also elicits a shift in thinking on their presentation and continuity. If we consider the order of things in conservation and curation seriously, apart from its theoretical implications, the suspension of the dichotomy of traditional ‘enduring’ objects versus ‘ephemeral’ short-durational objects would release us from the urge to dissolve the conflicting poles in everyday practice. Instead of arresting change, and situating conservation as an active actor in this impossible mission, we may think of artworks of all kinds as ever-changing and evolving entities that continually undergo physical alteration and transition.

Accordingly, curation and conservation could be considered a temporal intervention in these artworks. Rather than assigning it regenerative capabilities (sometimes
wondrously allowing the artwork to return to its ‘original state’), conservation would instigate just another change to the work in its long- or short-durational existence, compliant with archival and cultural permissions and/or limitations. Dependent on the cultures of conservation, it is the archive that establishes the rules and sets limits on what can be said or made, both with reference to the present, as well as to the past (Holling 2013: 217-65; Holling 2015: 73-90).

Rather than suggesting that performance theories are the non plus ultra to continue this inquiry, they may, I believe, offer an opportunity to rethink traditional objects in terms of duration. This, in turn, might expose the hidden deficiencies of theories long applied, and once and for all allow us to let go of the belief in the apparent stability of objects that for too long offered a skewed message by isolating the negative qualities of change.

The kind of thinking in the expanded field of curation and conservation presented here fosters the acknowledgment of changeability and impermanence of these media as a condition of possibility for their survival. As Jack Gladney in Don DeLillo’s White Noise, once said: ‘I’ve got death inside me. It’s just a question of whether or not I can outlive it’ (DeLillo 2009 [1985], 150).

Notes:
1. This essay originated as a paper presented during the symposium Authenticity in Transition at the Glasgow School of Art/University of Glasgow (1 – 2 December 2014) and on the occasion of 2015 College Art Association Annual Meeting in New York (3 February 2015, session Preserving the Artistic Legacies of the 1960s and 1970s). A web version can be accessed at https://medusa.wordpres.com/2016/01/07/revisions-or-the-antithesis-of-change/.
2. Where a Cage might have also had in mind the impossibility of the object to reproduce or embody the work (as in his use of conventional notation), my treatment of his statement relates to the problem posed by the conception of a static object – a persistent notion in art theoretical and conservation discourse.
3. “Namoi’ isn’t a Kunowski niche so large, we can fill, somehow passers” (my translation).
4. In turn, inspired by the American artist Michael Fried with a certain form of performativity, the direct act of minimalism becomes theatrical (Fried 1998 [1967]).
5. The number of filthys produced by Macanah probably exceeded 20.
6. Distributed by Electronic Arts Intermittent (EAI), New York.
7. With these variants the possibility of existence of Zen for Film is not yet exhausted. An 8 mm projection complicates its early history as a 16 mm film projection. Further the questions of the documentary status of Zen for Film as a digital film (a part of Fluxfilm Anthology) raise an interesting debate as to the relation of the artwork in its documentation and the films that often separate them.
8. Early on, Zen for Film was a linear projection.
9. In Revolutions—Zen for Film, I have pursued an extended analysis of Zen for Film’s multiple inclusions fostled with the process of its distribution and misappropriations.
10. Encouraged by the author on the occasion of the preparations for the exhibition Revolutions—Zen for Film.
11. Zen for Film would, in this case, pose an exception. Its leader presents us with no images, no films photographs that might have Burks’ essence of the filmic medium.
15. My argument approximates a similar debate in musicology concerning the group of musical work in terms of performance rather than a product-commodity (see Cook 2001). For contingencies and instabilities of the event and their relation to performance as a primary postmodern mode, see Katz 1994.
16. Burks, who practiced ‘religious conversation of his artwork’ (Eric Magnus) or Paul Tick, who desperately sought support to keep the residues of his conceptual installations being an example. For a discussion of curation of Burks’ performance artefacts, see Magnus 2009.
18. For an intriguing thought considering art as documentation, see Goyer 2008.
19. There is one more aspect worthy of our close attention. As no artwork exists outside the context of that which remains of it, the medium (in both its material and immaterial format) might become identifiable by the change it experiences. It is the transition, determination, remediation, simulation and re-enactment that offer the point of access to the understanding of the nature of changeable works.
20. In this context, thinking about time in terms of instability rather than in terms of stabilised, mechanised way of time measurement appears more adequate.
21. According to Deleuze, if there was no difference in repetition, things would be identical: repetition is opposed to the finite and identity of representation (Deleuze 1994 [1988]).
22. Michael Century (Professor of New Media and Music, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy), in discussion with the author, October 2013.
23. Century speaks about the open, improvisational and alchotonic character of the score on a continuum as opposed to the closed, routine, autochthonic score (Century 2014).
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