

# 卡拉宾小组： 石头在听吗？ Karrabing Film Collective： Do Rocks Listen?

10.14-12.18.2021

上海纽约大学，

ICA艺术馆

ICA at NYU

Shanghai

178

展评

上海纽约大学当代艺术中心的展览“石头在听吗？”是卡拉宾小组（Karrabing Film Collective）在东亚地区的首次个展。展览收录了该团体自2013年成立以来的全部影像作品，并基于作品的创作顺序和叙事基调，安排了“我们是这样成为卡拉宾的”、“干预三部曲”、“真实的虚构”，和“未来的当下”四个章节，在展厅和线上放映。展览延续了上纽ICA在过去两年持续发展的，对生态批判的兴趣；在更基础的社会语境层面，它向自身和观众提出了一个问题：澳大利亚北领地的原住民知识生产和中国乃至东亚有何关联？我想为进入这个问题提供一个不那么晦涩的视角，它建立于“嫉妒”。

卡拉宾的短片《嫉妒者》（The Jealous One, 2017）围绕着两条线索展开。雷克斯（Rex Edmunds）试图进入自己的国度，穿过一片被认为是黑水蛇梦时光的平原<sup>1</sup>，前往金溪地（Tjindi Creek）参加澳大利亚原住民的“烧布仪式”。一道铁闸挡住了他，根据1976年通过的《原住民土地权利（北领地）法

案》，他必须将个人资料交给政府指派的人类学家审核，才能获得自己国度的进入许可。与此同时，在雷克斯居住的社区，特雷弗（Trevor Bianamu）责难妻子罗宾（Robyn Lane）与其他男人一起喝酒。他因此得罪了罗宾的兄弟，被家人排挤，不能与他们一起跟随雷克斯前往金溪地。为了复仇，特雷弗带着自己的儿子和亲族，游过地下300公里的海水甬道，来到仪式场地外，一把火烧了大家的车，并试图把汽油倒进海里点燃。

在原住民非线性的时空中，这个故事其实一直在发生：海怪（特雷弗的梦时光）总是在嫉妒；它因此得罪了摩因犬（罗宾的梦时光），被动物祖先们排挤，无法参加“寇若贝里”舞宴（corroboree）；于是他愈发嫉妒，计划偷走大家的火种。故事中，摩因犬总是在前往自己国度的途中，身边总是有捕鹰鸡莱登，它们喜欢一起在路上挖山药，后者最后听从尖吻鲈的召唤，从海怪手中救下了火种。

在第十三届上海双年展看到这件作品后，我一直在想“嫉妒”，一

个不太有思辨余地的词，何以会成为影片的核心隐喻。借这次展览组织的作品研习活动，我向参与者们抛出了这个问题。一番讨论之后，我们的注意力转移到片中的白人官员和雷克斯对白上——“……我自己的国度”、“我怎么知道那是不是你的国度”等句中反复出现了物主代词，提示着所有权在殖民者和原住民之间的话语空间里，是个绕不开的概念。更准确的说，用土地所有权代替一切原住民和土地之间的原有的、建立于身体和感知的，人类生命和另一种有灵物之间的责任关系，是殖民者管控原住民领土和分化其社群的主要策略。<sup>2</sup>而嫉妒，这种与“你占据了本该属于我的”这一叙事结构伴生的情感，自然地与私有制紧密相连。

谁是那个嫉妒者？定居殖民是嫉妒引发，又借以发酵的过程吗？我不确定这样提问是否避重就轻。但毫无疑问，在当代澳洲原住民的社群中，嫉妒曾经且持续地被播种。此次展览中循环播放的短片《暴乱》（The Riot, 2017）正说明了这点。影片通过卡拉宾成员的口

📺

卡拉宾电影小组，《嫉妒者》（影像静帧），2017年，单频影像，彩色、有声，29分29秒  
Karrabing Film Collective, *The Jealous One* (video still), 2017, single channel video, color, sound, 29 min 29 sec

由堪培拉的原住民语言和艺术基金和埃因霍温的范阿贝博物馆资助创作  
Produced with funding by the Indigenous Language and Arts Grant, Canberra, and Van Abbemuseum, Eindhoven

REVIEW

179

“Do Rocks Listen?” at the ICA at NYU Shanghai was Karrabing Film Collective’s first solo exhibition in Asia, showing the complete collection of their works since 2013. The exhibition brought together a composition of four screening series—“Intervention Trilogy,” “Real But Got Story,” “Future Present,” “How We Make Karrabing”—available at both the ICA’s gallery and online screenings. The ICA’s interest in ecological critique in the last two years has also determined the exhibition’s rationale. On a social level, it asks the audience: how does the Aborigines’ knowledge production in the Northern Territory of Australia relate to us and where we are? I would like to offer a less obscure perspective into such a question: the notion of jealousy.

*The Jealous One* (2017) revolves around two parallel stories. Rex Edmunds attempts to enter his own country, crossing the territory deemed the Black Water Snake Dreaming, to attend a rag-burning ceremony at Tjindi Creek.<sup>1</sup> He is stopped by an iron gate—according to the Aboriginal Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act 1976, he would be trespassing if no legitimate documents could be handed in to the appointed anthropologist onsite. Meanwhile, in the community where Rex lives, Trevor Bianamu is chastising his wife, Robyn Lane, for drinking with other men. In so doing, he offends Robyn’s brothers and is ostracized by his family, thence unable to travel with

them to Tjindi Creek. In revenge, Trevor, with his sons and other kin, swims through a 300km seawater canal, arriving at the ceremony grounds to burn everyone’s car and set fire to the sea.

Parallel to the stories are the Dreamings and the totemic reincarnations of these tales lived, believed and told by generations of Aborigines. The Sea Monster (Trevor), easily jealous, offends the Moiyn (Robyn) and is banished by the animal Dreaming ancestors from attending the corroboree; as his jealousy grows into a plan of revenge, he steals everyone’s fire. Meanwhile, the Moiyn hounds are always on their way back to their country, accompanied by Leyden the hawk-catcher, traveling and digging yams together. The hawk-catcher eventually saves the fire from the Sea Monster at the call of the Barramundi.

Since first seeing this work, at the 13th Shanghai Biennale in 2020, I have wondered how “jealousy”—a concept not so appealing to critical theorization—became the core metaphor of the piece. I shared my confusion with the participants of a study session held at NYU Shanghai. Through discussion, we noticed a subtle clue in a conversation between the white officer and Lex: the strong presence of possessive pronouns in expressions such as “my own country” and “your country” reminded us of the inevitable power of the concept of “possession” for both the colonized and the colonizers. Or more accurately, the main

agenda and strategy of the colonizers to gain control over the Aboriginal territory and splinter their community was to replace existing, embodied, and perceived reciprocal relations between Indigenous bodies and land as sentient beings with the notion of ownership.<sup>2</sup> Jealousy—an emotion symbiotic with the syntactic clues of the “you have taken possession of what was mine” narrative—points us instinctively to the logic of privatization.

Who is “The Jealous One”? Is settler colonialism a result of jealousy being exploited or the very source of it all? Either I have been distracted or my questioning is unfocused; nevertheless, my point is that jealousy has been partly implanted in Australian Aboriginal communities and has continuously shaped their contemporary experiences. It is evident in *The Riot* (2017), a visual ethnography that recalls Karrabing’s account of the origins and spread of violence in the Northern Territory in 2007. Recurring signs of “jealousy”—rather than “hatred” or “injustice”—were as real as they were abrupt. The media seemed to disagree, but the surge in violence did not result from the federal government’s establishment of Northern Territory National Emergency Response, also known as The Intervention.<sup>3</sup> Long before then, Aborigines, barred from making a living in the mining industries, had faced economic difficulties and suffered from the absence of infrastructural social welfare. The Aboriginal



卡拉宾电影小组,《我们就是这样成为卡拉宾的》(影像静帧), 2020年, 单频影像, 彩色、有声, 6分41秒  
Karrabing Film Collective, *How We Make Karrabing* (video still), 2020, single channel video, color, sound, 6 min 41 sec

图片致谢艺术家  
Courtesy the artist

述, 回溯了小组在 2007 年澳大利亚北领地的一系列暴乱中形成的过程。在众人对暴乱归因时, 反复出现的“嫉妒”——不是“仇恨”或“不公”——显得真实又突兀。与媒体报导相反, 暴乱不是因联邦政府同年发布的《北领地国家紧急情况应对法》(又称“干预”)而起。<sup>3</sup>早在“干预”之前, 原住民社会就长期困于贫穷, 并缺乏基本福利设施, 这使得持有土地的原住民们不得不与矿业合作, 改善生计; 1976 年确立的原住民土地权利法案反而成了分化社群的工具。之后的情况,

构成了卡拉宾“干预三部曲”<sup>4</sup>的大背景:“干预”法案使多个社群被迫离开自己的国度, 原住民社会面临更加严重的失向。

然而,《嫉妒者》有趣的地方在于, 故事中的嫉妒并不只是晚期自由主义治理术的产物, 或者说, 不完全等同于英文中的“jealousy”。它同时也内生于北领地沿海的原住民部落中, 这些部落的动物梦时光们在“嫉妒”以及其它诸种情结的驱使下演绎着固定的脚本, 穿梭于贝留恩 (Belyuen) 的地下水道, 将海岸和内陆的地景及社群联系在一起。

在定居殖民主义的幽灵和去殖民化的实践角斗的那些地域, 这两种嫉妒互相纠缠而变得难以分辨, 这也是当代原住民性的复杂之处。

正是在这点上, 一个理论困局产生了。在这两种嫉妒之间, 我们应该如何转译? 更宽泛地, 如何将原住民研究中的迫切需要被理解的概念, 引入不为这些情感政治预留空间的当代理论中? 长期以来,“嫉妒”都不是一个时髦的词。对于力比多驱动的消费文化来说, 它缺乏卖点; 对于社会学和批判理论而言, 它上不了台面。要谈嫉妒, 我们似

Land Rights (Northern Territory) Act 1976, presented as the basis for reforming Aboriginal society “legally” and “righteously”, instead caused its disintegration. These circumstances and resulting incidents constitute the setting for Karrabing’s “Intervention Trilogy”<sup>4</sup>: multiple communities were forced out of their countries while Aboriginal society at large faced great disorientation.

What interests me are the nuanced concepts of jealousy in *The Jealous One*. Here, jealousy is not merely a product of late liberalism; nor can we find its counterpart in the critical colonial linguistics or in English lexicon. Rather, it is autochthonous to the Aboriginal communities in the Northern Territory, where ancestral Dreamings, propelled by jealousy and its multiple emotional symbionts, act out fixed plots. They travel the water channel of Belyuen and accordingly weave together the landscapes of the inner land and the shores. In places where decolonization struggles against the specters of settler colonialism, the two modes of jealousy have become inextricably entangled and thus indistinguishable. Such is the complexity of indigeneity today.

How do we translate between the two kinds of jealousy? How do we make space in the current indifferent theoretical frameworks for recognizing such concepts of indigenous studies that exigently call for understanding? Jealousy has

hardly been a chic term. For libidinal consumerism, it lacks points; for sociology and critical theories, jealousy might not be of importance. To speak about it, we must go back to Greek myths, the Old Testament, folktales and oral history from the indigenous. At the same time, we do not want to label it premodern.

In an online reading group a few months ago, I asked Elizabeth Povinelli, one of the founding members of the Karrabing Film Collective, for her perspective. Speaking via videocall, she held up her glass and told me that it could be involved in the act of jealousy. Jealousy is a turning away when you do not get enough attention. In this sense, it opens a way for understanding nonhuman sentience. I recall a chapter in Povinelli’s 2016 book *Geontologies* in which she describes finding a fossil on the Northern Territory coast in the 1980s, which according to Povinelli’s friend Binbin was considered a Dreaming of the sea monster *durlg*. Binbin told Povinelli that *durlg* was her late husband’s and his kin’s patrilineal Dreaming. It had previously only been found near their former home in the south but was now discovered at the new locality where her children grew up.<sup>5</sup>

Manifestation is an act of care, whereas absence, hiding oneself, and turning away state jealousy. Manifestation and absence are reflected in the mutation of environments, shaping deserts, fossils, and swamps. Povinelli has pointed

out the difference between *guman* (to manifest) and *gaden* (to see) in the indigenous language Emiyengal; the former being “an intentional emergence,” namely disclosing oneself to specific persons as an immediate comment on local existents and demanding a response from the subjects.<sup>6</sup> Distinguishing between *guman* and *gaden*, as well as between care and jealousy, is a lifelong practice for the Aborigines, plants, nonhumans, and all geological forms of existence in the Northern Territory.

This notion of jealousy is thus perhaps a more relatable approach than other posthuman ontological schemata for bringing us closer to nonhumans. This has been precisely captured by writer and media scholar McKenzie Wark, who in her response to Povinelli points out that as colonial modernity reaches the heart of Australia, to ask whether rocks are sentient would be beside the point. We should, rather, imagine how they are turning their backs on us.<sup>7</sup>

Karrabing has become widely known in the contemporary art scene due in large part to their visualization of contemporary Aboriginal experience in relation to posthuman theories. Titling the exhibition “Do Rocks Listen?” is an astute curatorial decision, not only responding to Karrabing’s interest in the aforementioned theoretical connections but also encouraging Chinese audiences to explore. The differences in social contexts



卡拉宾电影小组,《我们这样成为卡拉宾的》(影像静帧), 2020年, 单频影像, 彩色、有声, 6分41秒  
Karrabing Film Collective, *How We Make Karrabing* (video still), 2020, single channel video, color, sound, 6 min 41 sec

图片致谢艺术家  
Courtesy the artist



卡拉宾电影小组,《我们是如何成为卡拉宾的》(影像静帧), 2020年, 单频影像, 彩色、有声, 6分41秒  
Karrabing Film Collective, *How We Make Karrabing* (video still), 2020, single channel video, color, sound, 6 min 41 sec

图片致谢艺术家  
Courtesy the artist

could have become a barrier between the exhibition's delivery and the audience's reception. Yet indigeneity is more than the counterpart to centuries of settler colonialism; it is a shared state among nonmodern humans, multispecies communities, nonhuman existences, and local ecocenes. Can indigeneity be conceived on an individual level? Is there indigeneity for nonhumans? Apart from settler colonialism, what other forms does colonialism take? These questions imply that

the concept of indigeneity itself entails expansion and decolonization. And such a task concerns all regions. At the same time, it cannot be substituted by concepts such as multiculturalism, the periphery, the nonmodern, quotidian practice, and local or alternative knowledge that have been revisited recently by authors, as these pertain more to human politics.

Finally, I would like to return to jealousy and analogous sentiments that are difficult to categorize in order to show how

they might connect discussions of indigeneity, art, and ecology across regions. *Samilin* in the Paiwan language in Taiwan denotes mourning, grief, and sorrow, and is often used to describe the desired aesthetics of landscapes, clothing, artifacts, carvings, nose-flute, and other natural or artificial forms of entities. *Samilin* is also the emotive core of ancient myths and folklores, and often manifests in plots where One-hundred Pace Snake has to say farewell to humans as the tribe modernizes, when community



卡拉宾电影小组,《Windjarrameru, 偷鸡摸狗的混账》(影像静帧), 2015年, 单频影像, 彩色、有声, 35分15秒  
Karrabing Film Collective, *Windjarrameru, The Stealing C\*nt\$* (video still), 2015, single channel video, color, sound, 35 min 15 sec

图片致谢艺术家  
Courtesy the artist

乎不得不回到希腊神话、旧约,或是原住民的口述历史中。但这也意味着,一不小心,我们就会就为它贴上前现代的标签。

几个月前的一次读书小组上,我就“嫉妒”向波维内利提出了以上疑惑。在 Zoom 的那头,她举起一个玻璃杯说,不只是人,这个杯子也会嫉妒;嫉妒就是当你没有得到足够的关注时,背过身去。这样说来,“嫉妒”是一个理解“非人”情状的入口。这更详细地体现于《地质本体论》中的一段记叙。八十年代的一天,波维内利在北领地的

海岸岩石上发现了一处化石,一位原住民朋友告诉她那是海怪(蛇颈龙),也是她已故丈夫家庭中父系脉络的梦时光。这只海怪本应在他们的内陆家园,却于多年前他们迁居此处后,向他们现身。<sup>5</sup>

现身意味着关切,而隐身、掩埋自己,和转身离去是嫉妒的表现;现身和隐身反映为物质变化,造就沙漠、化石、泥沼等种种环境样态。基于这个故事,波维内利指出 Emiyengal 语中 *guman*(显现)和 *gaden*(表象)的分别,前者是一种“自主地浮现”,即事物向特定

的对象现身,作为对本地境况的即时批注,并要求后者做出恰当的回。<sup>6</sup>分辨 *guman* 和 *gaden*,或说关切和嫉妒,是北领地的原住民、动植物、非人、和地质存在形式都需要终生学习的实践。

嫉妒,因而也许比种种的后人类本体论的理论图示,都能更有效使我们靠近非人。麦肯齐·沃克在阐释波维内利的研究时准确地捕捉到这一点。在她看来,当殖民现代性深入到澳洲腹地的沙漠,问“石头有没有心智”仍然不得要领,我们应该想象石头是如何正在背过身去。<sup>7</sup>

members are marrying out or pass away, and when there is a gradual alienation of humans from their ancestral spirits and Creation gods. It denotes a thoughtful sorrow, nourished by the constant reenactment of loss. Like the notion of jealousy in Karrabing's film, it has a complex genealogy and a potential orientation toward nonhumans.

If we were to ontologize jealousy and *samilin*, and locate them on a conceptual map, they probably both correspond to “desire” and the subject of modernity desire co-constructs with psychoanalytical discourses. In the narratives of desire, our quests determine the dynamics of all relations; yet when jealousy or *samilin* becomes the anchor of the story, we may then be able to see into the complicated and nuanced relations between human and nonhuman in a way that leads to a letting go of humancentric mentality.

- 1 Deborah Bird Rose, *Wild Dog Dreaming: Love and Extinction* (Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press, 2011), 11.
- 2 Laura S. Meitzner Yoder and Sandra F. Joireman, “Possession and Precedence: Juxtaposing Customary and Legal Events to Establish Land Authority,” *Land* 8, no. 9 (2019): 126.
- 3 Maggie Wander, “‘It’s Ok, We’re Safe Here’: The Karrabing Film Collective and Colonial Histories in Australia,” *Commonwealth Essays and Studies* 41, no. 1 (2019): 53–62.
- 4 “Intervention Trilogy”: *When the Dogs Talked*, 2014; *Windjarrameru, The Stealing*

- 5 *C\*nt\$, 2015*; Wutharr, *Saltwater Dreams*, 2016.
- 6 Elizabeth A. Povinelli, *Geontologies: A Requiem to Late Liberalism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2016), 57–69.
- 7 *Ibid.*
- 8 Mckenzie Wark, “Elizabeth Povinelli: When the Rocks Turn Their Backs on Us,” *Verso Blog*, 2019.

-----  
Liu Mankun is an author of contemporary art history and criticism, a PhD student, and a member of the Wanwu Practice Group based in Shanghai and Hong Kong. Her writing and research focus on contemporary art and moving image works that explore the geopolitical and conceptual multiplicity of indigeneity in Asia-Pacific through socially and ecologically engaging means. She currently works on themes including spiritual practices, survivance, and more-than-human inheritance.  
-----

Translated by Harriet Min Zhang

近年来，卡拉宾的作品在当代艺术系统中广泛流通。这很大程度上是因为他们的工作方法在当代原住民经验和后人类理论中间建立起了一个可视的界面。上纽 ICA 的展览以“石头在听吗？”为题，无疑展露了探索这一界面的兴趣。在这一点来说，华语地区的观众应该多少能够从中得到启发。另一方面，社会语境的不同，让本地观众对卡拉宾小组自身少了些关注的理由。然而，原住民性也许不仅是那几百年定居殖民主义的镜像产物，它还存在于其它没有完全卷入现代性的人群、多物种、非人存在形式，和本地生态位之间。原住民身份能够落实于个人吗？非人物种有原住民性吗？殖民主义只有定居殖民一种形式吗？这些问题意味着，原住民性概念本身需要被拓展和去殖，而任何地区都很难回避这一课题。同时，这一概念还暂时无法被多元民族文化、边疆、非现代、日常实践、本地、另类知识等等，在近期写作中又开始活跃的词汇代替，正因它溢出了人类历史政治的尺度。

最后，我想回到“嫉妒”所代表的那些难以归类的感性词汇，说一说它们如何连接起不同地区关于原住民性，艺术和生态的讨论。一个稍近例子是在台湾排湾族语言中的 *Samilin*。它表示哀思、古朴，排湾族的人用它描述对地景、服饰、器物、雕刻、鼻笛音乐等自然和人造形式的理想审美。*Samilin* 是排湾族口述历史和神话中的核心情感，它表现在百步蛇在部落被迫现代化的过程中向人类告别、族人的外嫁和死亡，以及人类与祖灵及创世神逐渐疏远的故事桥段。它所指的哀

思，是不断重演的失去所滋养的情状，与卡拉宾故事里的嫉妒一样拥有复杂的谱系，以及向非人敞开的潜力。

如果要为嫉妒和哀思找一个概念上的坐标，那它们也许回应着“欲望”，以及这个概念与精神分析的话语所共构出的现代性主体的故事。在欲望的叙事里，人的求取决定了所有的（生产性）关系；而以嫉妒或哀思作为故事的锚，我们也许能够重新说出人与非人之间更加复杂的联系，从而让渡出人的中心位置。

- 1 “国度”和“梦时光”是上纽 ICA 对“country”和“Dreaming”的中文翻译。在澳大利亚原住民的世界里，国度与现代民族国家是完全不同的概念，它不被土地所有权或现代政治主体绑定。详见上纽 ICA 的介绍。*Dreaming* 则是创世的力量、创造的过程和现象、创世时代在地面上行走的动物先灵、神话和历史发生的场所（地景），以及按照父系和母系传承的，联结起个人、家族、部落，和先灵的图腾名称。作为这些概念的总合，英文词汇“Dreaming”首先由西方人类学家提出，再反向地被澳洲原住民广泛采用。详见 Deborah Bird Rose, *Wild Dog Dreaming: Love and Extinction* (Charlottesville and London: University of Virginia Press, 2011), 11.
- 2 Laura S. Meitzner Yoder and Sandra F. Joireman, “Possession and Precedence: Juxtaposing Customary and Legal Events to Establish Land Authority,” *Land* 8, no. 9 (2019): 126.
- 3 2007 年北领地政府发布的一份调查报告反映原住民儿童在社群内遭受了性侵害，国会借此发布“干预”法案，重新对原住民土地进行管控，并收紧了教育资金和就业机会。Maggie Wander, “‘It’s Ok, We’re Safe Here’: The Karrabing Film Collective and Colonial Histories

- in Australia,” *Commonwealth Essays and Studies* 41, no. 1 (2019): 53–62.
- 4 “Intervention Trilogy”: *When the Dogs Talked*, 2014; *Windjarrameru, The Stealing C\*nt\$, 2015*; Wutharr, *Saltwater Dreams*, 2016.
- 5 Elizabeth A. Povinelli, *Geontologies: A Requiem to Late Liberalism* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2016), 57–69.
- 6 同上。
- 7 Mckenzie Wark, “Elizabeth Povinelli: When the Rocks Turn Their Backs on Us,” *Verso Blog*, 2019.

-----  
刘曼堃是当代艺术写作者，在香港和上海生活和工作。她在香港城市大学创意媒体学院进行博士研究，关注亚太地区与生态及原住民性有关的当代艺术和移动影像。