

一些反射, 折射和衍射 reflections, refractions, diffractions

Fotini LAZARIDOU-HATZIGOGA

我们花了数月时间找到的房子居然被一堵硕大的墙壁挡住正门。大概是实行多年的“街道美化”的成果之一——胡同的两边得有连续不断的新近粉刷的墙面；或者是因为之前的租客想要更加私密的使用这里。那堵墙最终于2010年11月8日我们搬进来的那天被拆除。成堆的瓦砾形成了一个临时的小山，几天之后瓦砾被清理一空，先前被遮挡起来的大窗户和门一下子显露出来。这就是我们第一次与对街邻居面对面，他们的家门正正好的对着我们的玻璃门。就风水而言，这是相当不吉利的，邪气会随意进出家门。没过多久，两个小镜子出现在了他们门口，避邪之用。我一直很好奇那些被改变了路线的邪气会去哪里……

有那样的大窗和大门向街道敞开，家作坊的前院空间就被用来组织公共性最强的活动。一开始家具的摆设就是为了举办和鼓励各式各样的集会：也许围绕着一个物品，也许是一个工作过程，一个想法，或者仅仅关于在场的彼此。因此，我们安排了两个大的工作台面用来放置各种工具，一些由简陋的小床改装成的座位区，用架子隔开空间，还有一些架子放置藏书，工具和各种杂物。¹ 从二维的草图板跳跃到家作坊四维的时空体，这些结构形成了一个存在于时间中的真实尺度的模型。这个模型既是一个真实的空间，也是一个对不同类型的组织、参与、艺术性和经济性产物的展现。

在后面，围绕着这些想象，一整个确切和不确切的规则和脚本在不断的被起草和履行。它们决定着这个空间将被如何使用——被谁用，何时用，用多久。这些脚本包含的内容有开放时间，谁拿钥匙，一个图书租借系统，演讲时背景音乐的大小，暖气的运转时长，打扫地板的频率。每一次关于这些软性条规的调整都是内部结构和权利变迁，不同的习惯和风格，对“开放性”的接受程度，还有在那段时间有多少人力这样实际的考虑的体现。

布鲁诺·拉图尔讲到制造者和被制造之间的“摇摆不定”（‘flip-flopping’）的关系，是说一个组织持续不断的变迁：从我们向脚本中插入指示的地方开始，延续至下一个场景，直到它们在某个点上受到挑战，从而不得不进行或多或少的改写。在过去的三年中，我们总是到达这些点，有点感觉像失败有点感觉像是成熟的标志。这是一个无休止的危机状态。这种“摇摆不定”也可以被看做是一种跳跃式前进，组织内部每次都重新调整然后重新开始，这样的变化成为这个存在延续的一部分，而“重新”存在是“提醒我们时间点t和t+1之间的那条总是对着我们打哈欠（或者微笑）的鸿沟，没有什么节奏能让我们没有痛苦的跨过

这个鸿沟。”²

这条鸿沟即是横在家作坊门口延伸出去的门槛，是门口那扇会反射出你的身影的大窗户，亦是那两个还挂在街对过的小镜子。在虚拟和实际的层面，镜子可以被看做是乌托邦和异托邦的交界点，一个我们尝试创造和一起栖居在其中的地方。³

汉译 Chinese translation: 张叶子 Yoko CHANG、乔业兴 Cindy QIAO

* * *

The space we had spent months looking for came with a large wall built right in front of its storefront. Possibly part of the yearly “street beautification” works that call for a continuous surface of freshly painted walls on both sides of the *hutong*, or an attempt to allow for a more private use of that front room, the wall was finally demolished with our entry into the space, on November 8, 2010. A pile of debris created a temporary mound that was cleared away a few days later, leaving the large window and door hiding behind the wall suddenly exposed. This caused the first confrontation with our neighbors across the street, whose door suddenly directly faced our glass door—a very bad condition according to *feng shui* principles, since it would allow the evil spirits to travel freely inside their house. Soon afterwards two little mirrors appeared over their entrance and window to repel that negative energy, and I kept wondering where it would get redirected to...

With that large window and door towards the street, HomeShop’s front space was meant for the most public type of activities. The furniture was initially put together with the intention to host and encourage various coming togethers: around an object, a working process, an idea, or just each other—two large working surfaces surrounded by various stools, a few pallets-turned-into-seating-areas, shelves that separated part of the space, and more shelves meant to house a library of books, tools and other objects.¹ Jumping from the two dimensions of the drafting board to the four

dimensions of HomeShop's chronotope, these structures formed a full scale model that would get inhabited over time; a model that would be both a real space and a representation of different types of organization, engagement, artistic and economic production.

Below, behind and around all this, a whole set of explicit and implicit rules and scripts were being constantly drafted and performed, which would equally determine how the space is accessed and used—by whom, when, for how long. Such scripts included things like opening hours, agreements about who gets to have a set of keys, a library lending system, volume levels of music played over the speakers, how long the heating stays on, or the frequency with which the floor is cleaned. The readjustment of those soft infrastructures kept reflecting changes in internal structure and power dynamics, different habits and styles, shifting attitudes towards “openness,” as well as practical considerations in terms of how many hands were available at each moment.

Bruno Latour talks about the “flip-flopping” between the position of being fabricators and being fabricated, describing an organization's continuous shifting from the sequence of inserting instructions into a script to the next instance of following those same instructions until the point where they are challenged and need to be rewritten, to a lesser or greater extent. During the past three years we have continuously arrived at such points, which were often experienced as realizations of failure and/or signs of maturity, a perpetual state of crisis. But instead of a back and forth movement, this “flip-flopping” could rather be understood as a resilient movement forward, with the organization re-organizing itself and starting anew each time, that change being integral to the very continuity of its existence and that “re” being there “to remind us of the gap which is always yawning (or smiling) at us between time t and time $t+1$ and that no momentum will ever allow us to cross without pain.”²

This gap is the extended threshold at our front door; it is the large window surface that reflects you while you are looking through it, those two little mirrors that are still hanging across the street and all the good and evil spirits dancing in-between. Both virtual and real at the same time, the mirror can be thought of as the meeting point between utopia and heterotopia, and this is the space we tried to create and inhabit together.³



--
1 In several of these instances, a kind of “critical comfort” was sought—a space where one could be comfortable enough but not too comfortable. Hence, for example, the partially backless seating around the high tables calling for productive postures, or the thin foam used for the large cushions covering the pallets and some shelves (which, however, did not deter people from taking naps on those cushions in the hot summer afternoons; after all, architecture always escapes...). 举个例子，“临界舒适”是指那种人会感觉到刚刚好的舒适程度的空间。比如放置在高桌腿的桌子周围，以便于摆出各种姿势而设置的只有部分靠背的座位。又如用于罩住小床和架子的大垫子只用较薄的填充泡沫做成。（但这没法阻挡人们在炎热夏天的午后在上面打盹，因为建筑总会变成隐性的……）

2 Bruno LATOUR, “What’s the story?” Organizing as a mode of existence”, 2008, accessed 2013 November 22, <http://www.brunolatour.fr/node/149>
布鲁诺·拉图尔，《“故事是什么？”存在模式的组织建构》，2008，引于2013年11月22日，<http://www.brunolatour.fr/node/149>

3 Foucault introduces the idea of heterotopia in FOUCAULT, Michel. “Of Other Spaces, Heterotopias.” Architecture, Mouvement, Continuité 5 (1984): 46-49, and talks about the mirror as a “sort of mixed, joint experience” between utopias and heterotopias. See also Michael EDDY’s “Utopia” on page 109.
米歇尔·福柯在《异托邦》中引入了异托邦的概念。Architecture, Mouvement, Continuité 5 (1984): 46-49。他讲到镜子是在乌托邦和异托邦之中“某种混合的、连结的经验”。亦参见109页Michael EDDY的《乌托邦》。