

刘辛夷: 十万八千里

Liu Xinyi: Hundred Thousand Miles Away

北京空白空间
WHITE SPACE, BEIJING
2016.6.11-2016.7.31

《复兴之路》，2016年

道闸机、聚氨酯发泡板、继电器、方钢、密度板
238.5-284.5 × 116.6 × 99.7厘米每件

The Road of Arab Ba'ath Movement, 2016

Boom barriers, polyurethane foam boards,
electric relays, square steel tubes,
medium density fiberboards

238.5-284.5 x 116.6 x 99.7 cm each

Dimensions variable



继个展“土豆烧牛肉”之后，刘辛夷在空白空间精心构建的两段视觉叙事组成了一篇关于全球社会政治现状的辩证性视觉散文，其中不乏大量双关语的使用。位于入口处迎接观众的作品《安全第一》（2016）由三组安检台组合而成，象征了当代社会对恐怖分子的抑斥情绪：安检台上，每个人都会被要求进行身体搜查，这暗示着因国家间的不信任感而生的一种绝对平等；与此同时，类似奥运会颁奖台的摆放形式又引出另一种完全相反的解读：以国家荣誉感为后盾的一种备受推崇的不公平。

尽管两个展厅中处理的信息不一样，但作品都触及到相关的话题，其中令人深有体会的是国际流动性的虚妄假象，以及对其不可能性的冷嘲热讽。作品《复兴之路》（2016）由一组四个道闸机组成，在短时间内反复上下运动，四个充满争议的领袖人物形象代替了路障杆：穆巴拉克、阿萨德、卡扎菲和萨达姆。政治人物何去何从、反反复复的窘困现状由此暴露无遗：要去哪里？为了什么？以及最重要的：在后全球化时代，反复渗透的形象是否还能作为具有指令性和描述性的恰当符号持续奏效？

最后，作品《查理一世》（2016）将近来针对《查理周刊》的恐怖袭击与“查理一世”联系在一起（“我是查理”被错误拼写为“我是查

理一世”）。我想，艺术家这种半真半假意图逃离当下全球困境的期待，听起来正像一位女性好友向我说起与男友关系时候那样：“我们怎么可能和解？”李博文（翻译：谢旖心）

Two years after the artist's exhibition "Goulash" in White Space, "Hundred Thousand Miles Away" is Liu Xinyi's first exhibition in the gallery that uses both spaces of the gallery. The two chapters together form a critical visual essay on global socio-political situations that is meticulously structured, and is not stingy with puns.

Greeting the visitors by the door is a token of contemporary terrorist abjection, *Safety First* (2016): three piles of security checkpoint plinths (on which everyone of us will be touched and searched). While body search plinths suggest an absolute equality that is curiously guaranteed by national distrust, medal podiums as found in the Olympics provoke the opposite: a celebrated inequality that is supported by national pride and glory.

The two chapters then dwell upon

different yet related topics. Experienced in one is a simulacrum of false international mobility, and caricatures marking the impossibility of it. *The Road of Arab Ba'ath Movement* (2016) is literally a group of four operating boom barriers going up and down in short intervals, but the booms are replaced by four targets of controversial leaders: Mubarak, Assad, Gaddafi, and Saddam. The predicament of in-and-out is here exposed: Where to? What for? And more importantly: is the image of repetitive penetrations still an appropriate descriptive and injunctive metaphor in the world of post-globalization?

Lastly, *the Charles I* (2016) relates the recent attack on Charlie Hebdo (the sensational line of "JE SUIS CHARLIE"), to the king of Charles I ("JE SUIS CHARLES I"). Just when the artist is anticipating half-heartedly escaping from the present global aporia, I wonder, like a girl friend used to say to me, regarding the relationship with her boyfriend: "how could we possibly reconcile?" Li Bowen