



To say that a person is ballsy—or that one “有种 *yǒu zhǒng*”—is a conceptual sleight of hand, referring to the thrusts of subjectivity towards praxis along what are for us here the transversal axes of culture. A slang phrase in Chinese that has come to popularity in recent years, 有种 *yǒu zhǒng* literally means “to have seed” and is used in the colloquial to refer to an act of courage or daring, to say that someone is gutsy. Historically, the reference is a dangerous claim to essences, as per the earliest known use of the phrase in Si Maqian's *Records of the Historian* (109-91 BC), which refers to innate differences between classes to justify ruling class hierarchy.¹ The seed, in this case, is a crucial distinction in traditional Chinese culture that carries one generation to the next, but abstracted into its current usage is maintained by an outward thrust of courage, guts that presuppose action. Seeds may contain all the fortunate or unfortunate weaponry to overdetermine our success in battle, but Xiao's clever claim that "you can never have a ballsy thought" is what sets us in motion here. This cue-ball rolls out not only with documentation of HomeShop since the last issue of *Wear* journal, but also calls forth a reflective map of potentialities, pregnant in their singular plurality. These are

说谁“有种”是在概念上要花样，是主体在交错的文化维度中向实践的突围。作为人们常挂嘴边的俚语，“有种”的字面含义是“有种子”，此语经常用来表示某种充满勇气或大胆的举动，用来形容某人够胆色。

就像陈胜和吴广那句极具煽动性的口号¹所表达的，“种”最初是当权者对权力分配的本质主义解读，指代一种维护统治阶级等级制的与生俱来的阶级差异。此语境中所谓的“种”在传统中国文化中代表的是代际传承的一种举足轻重的显赫，但是抽象到目前的用法当中时，它还保持着其关于采取行动前所迸发的勇气和胆色的含义。种性也许因其所包含的种种幸运或不幸的战斗能力而令我们在战役中的胜负早已注定，但是满口中所谓的“有种永远都不可能只是一个念头而已”正是我们行动的出发点，而我们关于有种的号召不仅记录了自上期“穿”以来家作坊的种种，它其实也是关于各种可能性的反思图景，它们孕育于其“本已复多的存在”中。这是群众的集中或聚合体，而非一经煽动便揭竿而起的群氓（“大叔”，让我们且念起同时进行的自上而下发动的对群众的驯服，以及，别忘记，我们边缘化影响力的情真意切），即哈特与奈格里所谓的诸众，我们在探索着能够在本地养晦韬光的组织形式，而家作坊通过系列出版而进行的练习也是一种呼吸，夜以继日，日以继夜。这个出版物系列的创意为 2008 所激发，在奥运行将结束之时它也被修正为一种逆

¹ “且壮士不死即已，死即举大名耳，王侯将相宁有种乎？”司马迁，“陈涉世家”，《历史学家的记录》。
“And if the warrior has not already died, let him die in the name of a great cause. But wouldn't princes, barons, generals and ministers rather have the seeds of their birth?” In Si Maqian, “House of CHEN She,” *Records of the Historian*.



concentrations or assemblages, but rather than the inflammation of masses (let us, *big Uncle*, remember the simultaneous taming of numbers from above and, *hey there*, the honesty of our marginal influence) as per Hardt and Negri's multitude, we are seeking the forms of organization that bide our time here locally, and HomeShop's play of exercises by series is a form of breathing, day by day by day. In 2008, that series was provoked and remediated as a reverse countdown towards the ending of the Olympic Games, the spectacular turning point by which all things contemporary Beijing are judged. This opening, and the post-orgy syndrome thereafter, led to little more than cynicism, however, and in 2009-2010 our exercises continued with eyes askance: *what the hell is meant by cultural exchange in the living paradox of a society newly fed on the two-system minus-plus-plus-plus political economy?*

Like most people here, exchange has us overwhelmed. The reality of the pressures facing the average urban dweller—car, house, spouse and stuff—are enough to make most (conveniently) neglect the politics at hand, and our insistence to document the urban environment and its implicating property values (*see the series on urban explorations and*

向的倒计时，而奥运本身也是一个蔚为可观的转折点，它被用来对当代北京的林林总总加以判断。然而开幕式和紧接着的后高潮症候带来的是不止一点点的愤世嫉俗，在 2009-2010 年间我们的实践也延续着之前的睥睨态度：活在所谓两种或多种政治经济模式所形成的悖论中，文化交流到底为何物？

和很多人一样，我们为交流所震慑。普通都市人必须面对的压力——车子，房子，马子和票子等等——这现实本身足以令大多数人（颇为痛快地）忽略触手可及的政治议题，而我们对都会环境以及与之息息相关的房产价值的不懈记录（参见有关都市探索的那一板块，以及“我爱你家”项目，14 页）正是对这种庸俗荒诞性的批判。然而我们不也曾市场中么，“我爱你家”项目小经厂分部的高潮除了将空间交还给那位脾气暴躁的王姓房东——他最后送别我们的一句话是“好了，我们现在就算没有关系了”——就是随之而来家作坊在地点和活动形态上的变化。在 2010 年 12 月 23 日，家作坊完成了从小经厂一个单门独户的店铺空间到位于北二条“社会交叉点”的前工人宿舍的四合院建筑的搬迁。我们创办了《北二条小报》（参见 26 页）以庆祝这次意义非凡的聚会，这份出版速度缓慢得引人谄笑的黑板报聚合了一天内的新闻与反省，目前得到了更多艺术家、设计师和思考者的支援，而人员与资源的增长亦令这种探索变得更加复杂起来。最初的一个

² “关于”，家作坊（2010 年）浏览 2012 年 3 月 12 日信息：www.homeshop.org.cn。
“About,” HomeShop (2010) accessed 12 March 2012, www.homeshop.org.cn.

the I Love Your Home project, page 14) is part of the critique of these banal realities. But we have been on the market as well, and the culmination of the *I Love Your Home Xiaojingchang* branch was the return of the space itself to grumpy landlord Wang—who terminally sent us off with an “Okay then, now [that that’s done] we have no relation whatsoever”—and the changing shape of HomeShop’s practice in location and form. On the 23rd of December 2010, HomeShop completed the move from a single-dwelling storefront space on the “little sutra factory” *hutong* to a former workers’ dormitory courtyard building on the second street of the “junction of social intercourse.” This juicy gathering was celebrated with the inaugural issue of *Beiertiao Leaks* (page 26), our ironically slow-published broadsheet with news and reflections on the occurrences of a single day, and now with a larger group of artists, designers and thinkers, our pool of stuff and resources increases the complexity of the query. What began as a space and its window front “used as the beginning points from which to examine ways of relaying between public and private, the commercial and pure exchange as such” became a space and a window front which looked more into itself, and we have spent this first year in the Beixinqiao area experimenting in toddler-like fashion with the forms of collaboration itself, whereby considerations of public and private are by no means dismissed but relayed as a spherical measure to new plays of form-content.² The Compass Crew define this as an “ethics of scale” (*see more about our Continental Drift into China on page 28*), and all this is to say that this issue of *Wear* journal seeks to coordinate the intersecting spheres of our practices via juxtapositions that bring the creation/production of art, service and

空间和它“被用作一个审视公与私、商业交流与纯粹交流等相互接续往复的起点”²的橱窗门面更多被用来检视自身，而我们在北新桥的第一年也在蹒跚学步般地尝试着协作本身的多种样式，此间关于公众与私人的考量并没有被摒弃，而是以某种球体的方式接续到新的关于形式 – 内容的游戏中来。“罗盘”成员将之定义为“规模的伦理性”（关于他们在中国的漂流，请参见 28 页），说了这么多，借由将艺术、服务和日常生活的创造 / 生产带入对话的各种并置行动，这一期的《穿》试图将我们实践的各种交叉领域协调起来。从有種的观点来看，彼特·斯洛特代克（Peter Sloterdijk）可能会说我们正在口吐飞沫。³

目前家作坊可能已经有了房子、马子什么的。但是我们还在骑自行车。我们必须问自己是否已经有种到去思考播下种子的长期意味，它不是一种对本质性的分门别类，而是对未来成果和前瞻思维的培育。此处，所谓范围的伦理也指涉到个人的领域，以及“使用宇宙这一词语的讽刺意味……在于它总是一种为了某种政治整体性而服务的简化了的结构”。⁴在这种主体性和宇宙之间，总还有房子与城市的构造，爱的邂逅，以及所有围绕着我们的事物的秩序与排列。这些都是社会政治组织的迥异视野，而且很明显，它们都被塑造为形式的各类关系——是从内部到外部再返回的接力，是将各种表面抚平捋顺，是某种令某人独立于世的特定“风格”的练习（可以参阅 92 页了解更多关于风格化及其投射于艺术机构的实践）。于是需要在形成中考察形式。这里所说的“有種”所追踪的运动描述了这样一种可能性，它同时作为并不意在某种目的、却关于建构自身的行动存在，即阿甘本所谓的“潜能作为潜能”。而这里所出现的某种共时性也是空间 – 时间的终极交遇，或者就是让 – 吕克南希所描述的“共在” (*with*) 的可能性，因此“在场所中移动”必不可少的正是时间：场所将自身敞开成为场所的时间，属于空间自身的时间。⁵存在，在有種中和有種是彼此相互关联的领域，它们像介词一样围绕着彼此起舞，这并非对主体性的确认，而是作

everyday life into constant dialogue. From a ballsy point of view, Peter Sloterdijk might say we’re foaming at the mouth.³

So now HomeShop has the house, spouse and stuff, maybe. But we still ride bicycles. And we must ask whether we 有種 *yǒu zhǒng* enough to consider the longer-term implications of the seeds we plant, not as a codifying of essences but the nurturing of future fruit as well as future thought. The ethics of scale here involves the sphere of the individual and “the profound irony in using the word cosmos... always a simplifying structure in the service of a political collectivity.”⁴ In between subjectivity and the cosmos, there are the structures of the house and the city, the encounters of love, and the order and array of all the things around us. These are all varying horizons of sociopolitical organization, and ostensibly, they are shaped as relationships of form—relays inside to outside and back, the smoothing of surfaces and the practice of a certain “style” which makes one manifest in the world (*read more about stylization and projections into art institutions on page 92*). This is to look at form *in formation*. “有種 Ballsy” is in this way the tracing of movement that describes potentiality in the same moment as a move towards not an ends but the constitution of itself as such, Agamben’s “potenza as potenza.” What occurs here as a certain simultaneity is the utter coincidence of space-time, or what Jean-Luc Nancy describes as the possibility of the “with” whereby “moving in place [*du lieu à lui-même*] as such also needs time: the time for the place to open itself as place, the time to space itself.”⁵ Being, being ballsy, and 有種 are thereby realms of association that dance like pronouns around one another, not as assertions of subjectivity but as “an act that, by definition, exposes



为“一种应当定义为展现自身的行动：它存在于展现给自身它就是它，或它在做它在做的事物。‘存在’停留在这一行动以及该行动的展现之中”。⁶于是有種只能成为一种关于内在性的表达，或一颗于外在性（作为一种意象或表现）中生长的种子，两者互相缠绕，分享着存在，或它是关于“迷失自我的目的正是为了拥有自我，共享自我并成为它的意义——这是全部的意义所在”。⁷尽管我们的阳性指涉多少有些庸俗，任何本质主义的概念应该被重新读解为一种本源的分享与复多。这里的破折号——这个和——道尽了这种关系，却同时也什么都没设。的确，提出这个问题多少需要点儿勇气，因为它在所形成的框架中，并没有已知的答案。它动摇了构成“我——你——我们”关系的主体，而它的情感转折是这样一种令人眩晕的轨迹，它坚持这个问题存在的可能，以及一种德里达式的“为这个问题而存在的共同体”。⁸

试图书写有種的话题，当然不过是某种平面上的迂回，在试图描述自我组织那锃亮硬壳之上微观的交错纹路时（若想多了解「*dorodango*」光亮泥球的结构，请参阅 128 页）也将其暴露，它必须以其自身分离的方式来理解——是某种超越，暴露和以期待惊喜的方式拓展自由。因此，有種并非基于传统编委会决策意义上的理由而成为这期《穿》的所谓主题，它也不是自我吹捧的借口之一。可能比真正有種要令人

³ “泡沫”正是斯洛特代克关于球体理论的第三卷《室内：泡沫之建筑》。在这里，泡沫被当作一种建筑的隐喻，借以描述一种以球状、多内室的居住单位的本体论，而这种居住形态由相对稳定的个人世界构成。Peter SLOTERDIJK「球体理论：谈给自己的空间诗学」，根据 2009 年 2 月 17 日在哈佛大学设计研究生院发表的演讲，《超越熵：当能源成为形式》整理（2010 年 4 月），浏览 2012 年 2 月 25 日信息：www.beyondentropy.aaschool.ac.uk/?p=689。Foam refers to the third volume of Sloterdijk’s theory of spheres, *Indoors: Architectures of Foam*, whereby foam is used as an architectural metaphor to describe the ontology of a spherical, multi-chambered unit of habitation made up of relatively stabilized personal worlds. Peter SLOTERDIJK, “Spheres Theory: Talking to Myself about the Poetics of Space,” based upon a lecture given at the Harvard University Graduate School of Design, 17 February 2009, *Beyond Entropy: When Energy Becomes Form*, (4 April 2010), accessed 25 February 2012, www.beyondentropy.aaschool.ac.uk/?p=689.

⁴ Peter SLOTERDIJK「球体理论前言」，发表于《Cosmograms》，由 M. OHANIAN 和 JC ROUYOUX 主编，柏林，斯腾伯格出版社，2005，236 页。Peter SLOTERDIJK, “Foreword to the Theory of Spheres,” in *Cosmograms*, ed. M. OHANIAN & JC ROUYOUX, (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2005), p. 236.

⁵ 让 – 吕克 · 南希《在单复》，斯坦福，斯坦福大学出版社，2000 年，61 页。Jean-Luc NANCY, *Being Singular Plural*, (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2000), p. 61.

⁶ 同上 Ibid., p. 69.

⁷ 同上 Ibid., p. 3.

itself: it is in exposing itself that it is what it is, or that it does what it does. ‘Being’ remains wholly within the act and in the exposition of the act.”⁶ To be ballsy can thus only be an expression proper (manifestation) of an interiority, or a seed that becomes only in exteriority (as image or representation), and the two are woven together as the sharing of Being, or the “*question of losing oneself in order to be of it, with it, to be its meaning—which is all meaning.*”⁷ Despite the vulgarity of our masculine references, any essentialist notion must be reread as such, as a sharing and plurality of origins. And the spacing given with that—the *with*—is the everything and nothing of the relation. Indeed, a certain amount of courage accompanies Nancy’s question, as it is a question that does not already bear an answer within the structures by which it is formed. It is an unsettling of the subject that reconfigures the “I-you-we” relation, and its affective turn is a spinning trajectory that insists upon the possibility of the question, upon the potentiality of a Derridean “community of the question.”⁸

Writing about 有种 ballsy, of course, is then only a rounding across surfaces that attempts to describe, but along the way, perhaps, bare the microscopic interstices on the shiny shell (*learn more about the structure of a dorodango ball on page 128*) of self-organization that must be conceptualized with its own departure—a going beyond, laying open and expanding of freedom as surprise. 有种 Ballsy is thus not the “theme” of this issue of *Wear* in a traditional mode of editorial decision-making, nor is it a pretense for self-flattery. Perhaps more awkward than really ballsy, it is an exposure that displaces, blushes the cheeks and then laughs, an attempt to move beyond, before and next to subjectivity, to surprise ourselves in ecstasis. An unresolute nearing, the community of the question. These are all innuendos, yes. And that itself is what we’re getting at.

⁶ 雅克·德里达「暴力与形而上学：埃马纽埃尔·列维纳斯的思想随笔」，发表于《写作与差异》，伦敦，劳特利奇经典，2002年，98页。
Jacques, DERRIDA, “Violence and Metaphysics: An Essay on the Thought of Emmanuel Levinas,” in *Writing and Difference*, (London: Routledge Classics, 2002), p. 98.

觉得尴尬的是，它是一种错置，绯红了脸庞然后朗笑，它是这样一种努力，试图超越、前置以及与主体性并列，然后用一种狂喜的状态来吓唬我们自己。是一种悬置未决的接近，问题的共同体。对，这全是暗示。而这本身就是我们所寻求的。

— 何颖雅 Elaine W. HO
2012 年春夏天
Spring into Summer 2012
中译 Chinese translation — 马然 MA Ran

本文所有配图 all photos accompanying this text — 何颖雅 Elaine W. HO

