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乌托邦 Utopia
Michael EDDY

“For me, the real alternative is institutions by artists who are reflexive—whose members are conscious of the economic dimension in which they are operating and also critical about utopian thinking.”

It would seem far neater to discuss HomeShop in the language of temporary autonomous zones, starting from the term heterotopia in its discussion of “real places,” than to conjure the idea of utopia, a word that today is used mostly euphemistically to denote undue and unrealizable idealism.

But to assume there is no place for utopian thinking today neglects a spirit—ranging from state terror to whimsical idiosyncrasy to parallel universes—that runs through our experiments in the here and now. In particular, Fredric Jameson’s positing of a “utopian impulse” allows us to extricate the term from burdensome mega-projects and find it in our own lives. It seems even playing one term off the other as inherently different or contradictory is problematic. My aim is to at least perfunctorily trace a few of the utopian dimensions of HomeShop in its potential and its reality, and what they point toward.

Space
Severance is a crucial utopian precondition; without it, no coherent order unto itself, outside of society’s backwardness, can develop. True, at HomeShop there is no moat, no jungle, no chasm of time. The shopfront itself is an indication of this, as its permeability opens the confines to myriad disturbances. Indeed any space that espouses publicness obviously cannot cut itself off completely, fixing a paradox in the very center of a utopian art space (more on that below). That said, the scale or quality of one’s ambitions has a lot to do with determining whether permeability can be included as a utopian trait; if the affects produced around the space do not stop at the threshold, perhaps the project is somewhat less contained and vaguer than the political and economic self-sufficiency of a commune, if aesthetic categories such as universality and judgment still hold. In any case, here they come: the visitors
creep through the courtyard door as if through a cosmic portal, and their gazes flutter around the vegetal surroundings like liberated lepidopterans, owl eyes overestimating, dilating the bubble into some kind of spaceship earth. You guys are so free, some say, a double-edged statement. There are few compliments so stinging to the open space as the praise of being inaccessible: I could never live like this, so free, so happy-go-lucky. This version of Shangri-La comes courtesy of the office worker.

Rules

Rules are types of founding documents of a society, like constitutions (the drafting of which is among the hobbies of would-be utopians). The system that supports HomeShop's functioning is based on a few concise principles formatted into a contract and a playful set of guidelines (by Elaine W. Ho and Fotini Lazaridou-Hatzigoga). Each new induction into the space is formalized with an exchange of signatures. The exigencies to have ostensibly binding agreements are pragmatic in the first instance, and totally normal; but then, they are also preparations for new occupants into a certain ecosystem, to orient toward some common understanding, with the edge of disensus somewhere off the page, not mentioned.

We can read in the contract the prospect of either harmony or dissonance; its convincing aspect is therefore not restricted to speech act alone but partly defers its normative pressures to communication by space, the thoughts and arrangements through it, its design. The laws thus laid out communicate an openness and ambiguity as to its specific uses: Big tables, moveable platform seating, shelf benches, a roll-up projection screen, a large window, white and grey. The system is never a regime of pure function, nor of survivalist idealism, but clearly administers a level of communalism, like many utopias. However, this is also demonstrated through behavior, and the practices that populate this named space elaborate to a fuller extent the local statues, i.e. how one should act.

Which is to say, rules don’t necessarily precede a society. They develop in a piecemeal manner. Notices start to creep up walls like an ivy species indigenous to co-op spaces. We try to institute routines—door-watching, irrigation, oil-scouring—they inflate, and then deflate. In the midst of this writing or rewriting, we in turn recognize that rules are written to be danced around, which has been the case since nearly the beginning, until the fabric of the space seems woven of exceptions. This form of slow “perfecting” is not commonly associated with utopias, which are often presented as if we arrive to them complete and unchangeable, and beyond the initial violence of birth; at best we might say this is what the road to utopia might look like (without a revolution).

Art

With the close of society’s pre-history, history and time become somewhat of a riddle. While variations can be imagined, the genre’s finality proscribes major crises—changes pass cyclically, nature returns, and life’s tempo carries on waves of shared meals, agoras and tête-à-têtes. It is a time for recuperating what was always tossed in the bin (or in some cases for periodically forgetting everything). While the Event is absent, time fills with an abundance of events. The theme of the everyday is at such time fully present. In our contemporary pre-history (however post-modern), experiencing and documenting everyday events orients toward reclamation of the rejects of conventional history. These could very well be the stirrings of Events to come. The art of the everyday, in presenting everything—well, not everything, but at least a sincere fragment of the marginalized—as significant and worthy of record, might be imagined to create (the grounds for) historical change. Pushed to its limit, such a project would diverge either toward the creation of Events themselves, their chancing-upon, or alternatively the mere recreation of the intractable “daily life” that submerges us in sameness every day.

Several problems: the contemporary technological eye that misses nothing even makes the post of the painstaking archivist seem redundant; rather than a people’s history recovering the neglected, the endless recording and documenting of today makes of history-writing an irresistible flow that pools in the bunkers of power. Add to this a certain inherently alienating quality about representation: how the local trifle lifts from its context and appears totemically on a screen thousands of miles away. On the other hand, the utopian project doesn’t limit itself to taking down notes and exchanging images—its tendency has been to imagine a world in which divisions between aesthetic, philosophical and political activity are blurred or totally eliminated.
Utopian projects produce spaces in which all aspects have meaning. The self-administering space, swerving in a cross-disciplinary fashion, muddling in details, creating the conditions for its own criteria of valuation, sinks its practice under the radar of conventional spheres. Holism is a recipe for obscurity, or vice versa. The resulting impression of being detached rather than dissenting can perturb the utopians only so much, because what is meant to matter is the practice. When it comes down to it, the public is abstract.

Work
Some visionaries may proclaim carnival at the heart of future societies, but the question of labor is also high on the list of conundrums for utopia. How can we be both free and stable? Creative and remunerated? Today’s answer: as an international freelance coworker. It is most likely what jobs look like in the bright future. (Ask a neighbor: these people aren’t working, they’re playing.) The theory being that if a group of people work together independently in a space, an amount of financial, material and creative cross-pollination can accumulate, creating a critical mass of opportunities enough to shape a kind of mutual economy. Meanwhile, co-workers contribute to space rental, and in theory surplus income leads to support of project costs. Artistically, this can mean avoiding the commercial gallery enclaves in a place like Beijing, and gaining the ability to control one’s territory, working where one would actually like to live.

The utopian implications of the creative co-working model become most apparent when we look at variants in places like San Francisco, where the gregarious mixing of culture and entrepreneurship is well known as the great hope of the faltering first world. In the capital-saturated cityscape of Beijing, with state and Coca-Cola tag teaming, the hyper-mediated environment renders utopian impulses compulsory: the search for a better future for oneself and one’s nation pulses across every surface. With the new chorus singing “Chinese Dream,” the creative class formula and its attendant individualism are no less mobilized.

Some repudiate work as a modern religion-disease, in which case imagining the future of “meaningful work” wouldn’t count as the most radical of propositions. Despite the materiality and immimence of tactical skirmishes with police, the outlook of declaring civil war comes across as more than a little utopian. As fellow utopians, how can we say that’s a negative thing?

Somewhat idiotically, we can only excuse ourselves on the grounds that it is patently unlikely, in our specific circumstances. More palatable than a collapse in the collective spirit, one of the reasons it is hard to conceive of spaces that aren’t penetrable to their core is because there are so many ways in these days. We are lodged in the no-man’s land between desiring change and starting from where we find ourselves; we invoke the utopia of the pluralistic planet, where one might freely transit between starkly different systems, and where “it is no longer the exhibit of an achieved Utopian construct, but rather the story of its production and of the very process of construction as such.”

Remainders
Facing a collision of utopias, let’s at last deviate toward the image of a “utopia of the mirror,” which was used to introduce the term heterotopia as a place between real and virtual. The mirror, an uncanny critical space adjacent and corresponding to our own world, brings us to an edge that it never quite divorces. What we see in HomeShop’s reflection is no funhouse; we see our own daily grind, with air pockets. In these fissures between individuals and identities, possibility is charged with indeterminate valences and, taken seriously, these make up the conditions for utopian impulses. Heterotopia is a byproduct.

The virtual and the real joined in the utopian mirror can also decouple.

Life: New pancakes and takeout trays and their accompanying thin-as-veil and useless plastic baggies all arrive, new packages drop from Taobao onto the cold marble aggregate, all is processed in a multi-absent-minded swirl, in a trail of cardboard, bottles and waste pulled by the oblivious urban tides out of the inner city, to the infinite junk corpora collecting like our giant doppelgangers on the edges of civilization. Meanwhile, the placeless place seems to settle into its own matter, and its ambiguity begins to resemble a natural state. Grape vines reborn from stumps unfurl, year after year, wider and unwieldier networks of foliage over the available airspace. Ruin and growth shift the ballast, easing into something homelier, and the sum-total weathering and inertia of everything
物从流逝连忘还，将这个他们眼中的桃花源视为暂时停靠在地球的太空飞船。他们说你们真自由，真是幸存者。少有这样对开放式的空间
“不可企及”的赞美能够如此利刃直刺心脏。被困在办公室里的白领们说：“我永远不能像你们这样，如此自由，无拘无束，如在世外桃源。”

规则
规则是社会形成的记录，如宪法（起草宪法是乌托邦主义者最为钟意的日常爱好），支持家作坊运行的基本系统建立在发展前和一套带
有戏剧意味的理论公式（由何新颖和Fotini Lazaridou-Hatzigoga
制定），每一新成员进来，合作就从双方在合同上交互签定开始。这
些看似具有某种“法律”效力的计划具有实用性，也能让新成员进入
一个生态环境，领会某种已经达成的共识，容易产生分歧的地方则
避而不谈。

我们可以从合同里读出和谐或不和谐，其最为令人折服的因素正
不仅局限于言语行为，而是通过空间形成达成的无形压力，如空间
的布置或设计。列出的规则在应用上既敞开又暧昧：大桌子，可以动
的座位，书架长椅，可拉伸的投影幕，大窗户，白与灰。这个系统既不
是一个纯粹为应用而制定的机制，也不是为保存某种理想主义而建
的护栏。而是像很多乌托邦实践一样，它是一种地方自治或自有的
主义的表达。这一点也通过行为体现出来，在这里进行的实践更
加丰满地诠释了当地特点——即人应该如何行动。
规则不一定先于社会。规则是慢慢发展丰满起来的。各种提示语像合
作空间里特有的藤蔓开始偷偷地爬上墙面。我们开始建立日常程
序——看门、浇水、换衣——它们充满、缺失。在白色和重写的过程
中，我们意识到规则就是用来绕开的，从空间的开始到最后各种例
外浮现为止。这种缓慢的“完美化”进程通常与乌托邦有关，因为后
者必然以完全、亘古不变的形态出现，丝毫不带诞生时的暴力。至
少我们可以说在乌托邦的路看上去是这样的（否则革命）。

艺术
随着社会前历史的闭幕，历史与时间成为了一个谜。虽然变奏可以想
象出来，艺术的终结性已经把所有危机的可能性都排除了——循环的
改变，自然的回归，生活的节奏带起聚餐、市集与相应。这是寻找被
遗弃之物的时代（但偶尔也是全盘遗忘的时刻）。事件虽不在于，诸
事件却补充了时间空缺。日常主题正是在这时间中完整地在场。
我们的当代前历史（无论它多么后现代），体验并记录日常事件是重唤
被传统历史拒绝之事。这种寻回同时也是拨动未来之事。日常的艺
术，在将所有——或起码是被边缘化之物的很大一部分——呈现为

* * *

“对我来说，真正的出路是由自省的艺术家建立机构。他们既清
楚自身运作的经济维度，又对乌托邦式思考采取批判态度。”

用临时性空间的话语系统来谈家作坊是最为活跃有序的，以异托邦
（heterotopia）概念进入“真实之地”世界比乌托邦（utopia）更为实
在，因为后者在今天成了难以实现的理想主义构建的客套说法。但如
果真有乌托邦思维在当今世界毫无立锥之地，那么我们期待着的乌
托邦——从目前来看，它完全地出现。具体讲，弗德里克·詹姆逊（Frederic
Jameson）曾说“乌托邦静止”能对乌托邦从各种大叙事中脱离出来并
用于自身生活。我本文的目标是把家作坊实践在现实与潜在层面的乌
托邦维度大略勾勒清楚，并引申出其面向的未来。

空间
割裂（severance）是乌托邦的前提条件之一。没有从社会落后之中的割裂
就难以形成自由秩序。诚然，在家作坊没有护城河、丛林或时间断层，
我们的内部对各种干扰性渗透的敞开就是建设。任何对公共空间的
探索都不能彻底把自己和外界隔离开来，在乌托邦式艺术空间的中心
钉上一个矛盾。我们面对的规模和强度与渗透性是否要作为某种乌
托邦特质被容纳到实践当中有紧密联系；如果在空间中产生的情绪反
应（affect）不足以于门槛，那么，与那些政治与经济自给自足的共产社
比，我们的边界就比较模糊，当然前提是“普遍性”与“判断”这类的
美学范畴仍然成立。无论如何，房客们来了，他们无声地从大门踏入，
仿佛通向一个宇宙通道，他们的目光如被解放的虫类类昆虫一般在植
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重要并价值记录者时，可能就开始为历史改变打下了地基。被推到极限的时候，这种项目不是走向诸事件的创造或偶遇，就是走向循环往复的日常生活的重要。

几个问题：当代科技审视明察秋毫，与其相比，作为细致的档案馆员都显得多余。与其说是人民的历史，寻回被遗忘的过往，倒不如说当今无数的记录让历史写作成一个无法抗拒的激流，浸透着权利的暗流。另有某种与传统异化特质隐藏在再现中，当地的事物是如何脱离自身语境如图幅般出现在世界另一端的屏幕上的？另一方面，乌托邦构建并非仅局限于政治和交换图像，它必然走向一个美学、哲学与政治活动间的边界都被模糊甚至被打破的世界。

乌托邦计划创造出全方位有意义的空间。这个自我做主的空间，在全球间穿梭，在细节之间交错，建立起自己的价值评判标准，实践进入了难以被常规探头察觉的领域。整体论的空间构建必然导致朦胧，没有棱角，实践本身的重要性往往为缺少对事或事关己的态度提供了托辞，公共在这里是抽象的。

工作

一些有远见者或许会说未来社会的心脏是狂欢，但工作也是困扰乌托邦的重要节点之一。我们如何将自由权利和稳定，既富有创造性也能赚到钱？今天的回答：当一群国际职业者，这里是未来职业的图形与蓝本（邻居：帮人不工作，整天玩儿），基本思想是如果一组独立职业者在同一个空间内一起工作，定有经济、物质、创意层面的变化，通过创造可供空间，形成共同经济体。同时，大家通过承担房租，将多余的费用用于运营。艺术上讲，这种操作方法能够帮助避免商业画廊的弊端，并赢得控制自己领地的能力，让个体能在自期望的地方工作和生活。

当我们把目光投向共同工作模式在世界其它地方的运转方式时，其中的乌托邦意涵越是明显而易见。以旧金山为例，这一人文化与企业文化的完美结合之地是处于混沌边缘的第一世界最后的希望。”反观被资本充斥的北京，国家权力符号与可口可乐商标成就了一个超媒介化环境，让乌托邦运动变成了强迫性运动。新的歌唱是“中国梦”，同时形成了创意者阶层以及配套的个人主义。

有些人视工作为现代宗教疾病，如果顺着这个思路想，对未来“有意义工作”的诉求就不是最具有颠覆性的命题了。尽管在管理层面有着难以避免的打打闹闹，如果上升到业务影响的程度就不止是小乌托邦那么简单了。同为乌托邦主义者，我们怎么能说这是一件消极的事呢？

急速地讲，我们只能为自己解释说这一情况在我们当下处境中是不太可能的。所以难以构想一个内核不可拆的空间是因为有太多方法可以一举摧毁。我们被夹在期望改变与无奈现状之间的无人区，试图唤醒另一星系的乌托邦，人们可以在不同的系统中穿行，“不再是一个已经完成的乌托邦结构，而是其构建过程中的故事与过程本身。”

残留

面对着乌托邦的相撞，让我们开始转向图像乌托邦发展。这个概念原被用来带入作为真实与现实之间的异托邦。八镜像，作为我们与世界相联的批判性或虚拟空间。我们将不断到一个脆弱互联边缘，我们对家作坊的反思中发展出这个非现实：看到日常的废墟与真实、在这些个体和身份的断层中，可能性被各种不确定意义占据。严肃地讲，这些组成了乌托邦的冲击的条件。异托邦是一个衍生品。

在乌托邦镜像中的虚拟与现实也可以重组。

生活：新出炉的烤饼与外卖盒和它们轻薄到一无是处的塑料袋纷至沓来。快递包装盒从淘宝网上直接被甩到大理石地砖上，市中心的激浪在这里打转，汇成心不在焉的涡流——纸盒、瓶子、塑料袋狼藉一片，文明的边缘堆积成我们赚来的分身。同时，乌托邦开始自我运行，其暧昧开始相似自然状态。葡萄藤从树墩上重生，夏去冬来、越发疯狂的植物网逐渐把有限的空间封上。败亡与生长越发繁重，四季更替与健康让环境映出永恒的光泽，厨房由油烟蒸煮，各种莫名出世的物体被遗忘在窗台上，铁门半掩，植物在无人知晓中枯萎，人与人不再相遇，废墟是乌托邦的影子，抑或是乌托邦本身，它们是过往系统中的化石，尽管如此，它们仍具有过时的帝国一样，未来的兴起已经悄然开始。

谁会欺骗自己，认为家作坊是个乌托邦呢？家作坊最终是个镜像。我看着镜中自己。

汉译 Chinese translation: 欧阳 موا OUYANG Xiao, 胡默然 HU Moran

3. As expanded on in Fredric Jameson’s Archaeologies of the Future (2005), the topic of two meetings of the Happy Friends Reading Club in spring 2013.
4. 2013年家作坊的两次快乐朋友读书会都对弗德里克·詹姆斯的《未来考古学》做了专门阅读。
5. A list of impulsive: "In the Principle of Hope, Bloch provides an unprecedented survey of human wish pictures and day dreams of a better life. (...) In Part III, Bloch applies his utopian hermeneutics to the wish pictures found in the mirror of ordinary life: to the utopian aura which surrounds a new dress, advertisements, beautiful masks, illustrated magazines, the costumes of the Ku Klux Klan, the festive excess of the annual market and the circus, fairy tales and kolportage [sic], the mythology and ideology of travel, antique furniture, ruins and museums, and the utopian imagination present in dance, pantomime, the cinema and the theatre." Wayne Hudson, quoted in Jameson, p. 2.
Teapot Exhibition

Teapot exhibitions was a series of solo shows by artists, organized from 2010 in HomeShop by Michael Eddy, until the exhibition space fell from the toilet and shattered in early 2013.

“茶壶展览”是一个由众多艺术家参与的系列个展，2010年在家中由Michael Eddy发起，结束于2013年初，因为茶壶不幸由马桶水箱中落入便池。

The following exhibitions were hosted on the teapot 茶壶举办的各种展览如下:


The first 4 exhibitions were by Michael EDDY in his home. 最初的四次展览由Michael EDDY在家制作举办。