

伯諾瓦·布洛伊薩特  
在有機的生命裡：

訪談錄

**In vivo:**

an interview with

**Benoît  
Broisat**



物非物 訪談系列  
在有機的生命裡：伯諾瓦·布洛伊薩特訪談錄

物非物展覽製作出品  
呂岱如策劃

**Never odd or eveN Interview Series**  
**In vivo: an interview with Benoît Broisat**

Conceived in the making of the exhibition Never odd or eveN  
Curated by Esther Lu

EDOUARD MALINGUE GALLERY

或許真實世界在他方，  
然而事實卻是站在我和我的身體這邊的……

呂 我第一次看到你的作品《目擊者》時，心想你八成是個偏執頑固的老頭吧。世上哪種人會去把新聞媒體上報導過的東西找出來，孤注一擲地花了這麼多的時間和資源，跑到地球的另一邊去取得新聞圖片上的物件呢？後來有機會到你的工作室親自拜訪你，你為我一一介紹了你的作品，而我當下立刻被你對於影像本質，從其態度、功能、物質性、與回憶的關係、在現實中的可信度等所展開的各種新鮮探索和審問感到興奮與好奇。像一種難得的體驗，我藉此透過猶如兒童的心靈來觀看事情，重新理解在景觀社會中生活所需付出的代價與意義。你藝術創作動機和探索間流露出的純粹度與好奇心相當具有啟發性，而我好奇你是否還記得自己小時候的影像和媒體經驗嗎？是否有任何關聯引導你走向今天的創作之上？或者，我可以問問你個人在影像經驗上的最大挫折或是奇想？

**布洛伊薩特** 老實說，我真倒希望自己是偏執頑固的老頭！我是那種嚮往可以走出藝術之外進行創作的藝術家，因為我相信「純粹行動」的美。拿瑪莉娜·阿布拉莫維奇的無聲對坐來說，假如她今天是一名書記官，突然決定要跟隨自己的一股衝動放下工作，跑去整天盯著陌生人看，我想這會是一個讓人驚豔的行動，毫無預設立場，沒有報酬，無需尋求來自社會的認可。但是瑪莉娜·阿布拉莫維奇是位行為藝術家，而這個脈絡事實上在正當化她的作品時，便減損了這個行動的魅力。某個程度上，一位行為藝術家安靜地坐上幾個小時


或是在走道上赤裸地站著是非常理性的決定，就像一名書記官去影印法律文件一樣合理。在《目擊者》裡，也是一樣的狀況。我希望這是一種簡單的、源自個人內心想要滿足一種存在性需要的欲望和行動。但是，我同時是一位藝術家，不管我喜不喜歡，這個角色改變了我行動的意義。

所以，我其實很開心聽你提到我動機中的「純粹性」，儘管現實中是混雜的。也正如妳所猜測，我對媒體的特殊態度的確受到我童年生活影響。我小時候住在阿爾卑斯山邊的小鎮上，完全荒蕪，周圍被群山擁抱，而我覺得好像被排除在世界以外，或更精確地說，像詩人蘭波所形容「真實世界在他方」一樣。因此，我對媒體產生了非常矛盾的態度。

媒體對我來講變得非常重要，像是通往我所認為是「更為真實的」現實的聯結，但只能遙遠地去觀看這個世界是相當挫折的感受。影像是如此關鍵卻又不足。它們讓我只想去體驗真實事物，而非滿足我的好奇心。當時，我也開始意識到藝術家所創造的影像是不一樣的，他們不單是一種片面承諾，而是自成一體的世界。《目擊者》的確清楚地是我個人對從前感受的一種長期回應。

提到我「最大的挫折」，那我來說一個有趣的故事。在我還非常小的時候，四、五歲時吧，我做了一個夢。在一個空白的空間裡，我前面飄有一張巨大的白紙。我在紙上「畫畫」，但並不用鉛筆或筆。那張紙像是我心裡面和外部世界的一道門，所有我想像的東西都在紙上自己轉換出來，成為真正的、具有形體之物。妳可以想像那是怎樣的一個美夢，而我醒來

的時候非常傷心！我真的非常失望，而這個夢就這樣一生追著我跑一樣，我認真地覺得我創作有很大一部分理由是為了要還原這個夢境。



《邦納鎮》· 2004  
影像截取 · 錄像 12'30"

*Bonneville*, 2004  
Video still, video, 12'30"

呂 聽你講這個私人故事真的很妙，我覺得這個夢以及你小時候的媒體經驗的確回應我所感受到你作品裡的一種天真性情。但當然你說的沒錯，你的藝術家位置已經轉換你行動的意義，也明示藝術機構如何為你的實踐背書，讓我們得以稱之為藝術。在這樣的狀況下，你如何合理化或是拿捏你的工作來對這樣的創作位置妥協？你有想像過你以其他不是專業藝術家身份的方式來繼續做你想做的這些事情，來滿足你的存在性需求嗎？

布 我認為這問題實際上更為複雜。「天真性」、「純粹性」對我而言是指某人完全不受任何外在動機或想法的干擾而完全沉浸在個人世界裡的狀態。這有點接近人類學家露絲·潘乃德描述的禪學，是一種將自己與「觀我」的分離。十三世紀的道元禪師在其訓示裡提到：「我學到眼睛是水平的，鼻是垂直的。」而茶師千利休也曾如此形容其藝之本質在於：「首先你煮滾水，然後你泡茶並且喝下。」這些簡單明瞭的揭示讓人幾乎相信專業的知識與技術終究是一種阻礙，而成為一名茶師或悟道就是別去練習茶道或是冥想。然而弔詭的是，如此簡單的道理卻是要一段漫長的學習才能成就、領悟到的。白癡與智者看來是一樣的，但他們的純真感卻是對稱的。我想，這和非藝術是一樣的道理。對我來說，艾倫·卡布羅（在《不能成為藝術的藝術》）發明一種「刷牙的方式」時，和千利休是很相似的。就像要一名茶師不具藝術地備茶，藝術家也要感受到非藝術的召喚才行，也因此，儘管對於非藝術的幻想是非常有趣並且刺激的，卻也同時不能忘記這是一道



不斷褪去的地平線，一個只能遠觀的海市蜃樓，而這之間的距離正是來自藝術自身。我可以像艾倫·卡布羅想像他的「去藝術家教育」地，盤算一種讓我的創作實踐在藝術脈絡以外的游擊策略。不過，這種以藝術為目標的藝術出走，終究只會是一種不敢稱其名的藝術。

換個方式看，對我而言，我行動的脈絡文本如何建構意義是很重要的。我並不同意那種將藝術視為一個優越領域而和其他人類活動分開的理想主義概念。或許對於那整天關在自己工作室獨立工作的藝術家來說，可以很輕鬆愉快認為他面對面地探究真善美的本質問題，可把對其作品的評價，其商業化過程都完全托付給畫廊，將之視為一種附帶性的部分，一種世俗化的部分。與之完全相反，我認為藝術像所有其他活動一樣都仰賴互存性的網絡，也因此，沒有藝術系統就沒有藝術，而借用奧費·蓋爾的說法，其涉及不止藝術家，而是一連串的介媒。用一種拙劣的方式模仿莫里斯·德尼，我認為一幅畫在被各種顏色集合成為某種秩序的平面以前，原是一種人造物，是被某社群給定義成為藝術，也因此，它被賦予在此領域內的使用、交換、象徵性價值。


基於我剛形容的夢，或許也不意外我將藝術作品視為具體化的思考。通過藝術，原非物質性的、智性的成為有形體的，可被展示、傳遞、轉化與討論。對我來說，這個循環的過程超越一種次要的特性，反而是藝術物件真正的目的。當杜象在1917年將《噴泉》放到獨立藝術家協會展覽時，他或許是第一個藝術家創造非藝術本身特性上的價值，而是其引發的反應。他

「玩」藝術就像玩棋一樣。小便桶就像是搬他到藝術場域的西洋棋盤，而他迫使這個協會的成員都要進入這個遊戲來應付他的攻擊。像許多藝術家一樣，我也是杜象的跟隨者，然而我的創作位置也和他有諸多不同。首先，或許是全球化的一種效應？我希望我的遊戲場是整個世界，而與我互動的不止是策展人、藝術家、藝評，而也可是東京的一名上班族、泰國嘟嘟車司機、科羅拉多州的牛仔。很重要的，我希望我的作品從一開始就是建立在對話性上的。杜象僅操作傳統的藝術家—觀者的兩層關係。在《噴泉》這件作品上，他提出這個作品，而讓委員會來回應。而在我的《目擊者》中，我試圖讓介媒的參與作為「成為藝術」過程自身。當我聯繫物件所有人時，會告訴我我希望這個我有興趣的物件可以成為藝術品，而他有決定權去同意或否決這樣的請求。究竟在何種基礎上，微不足道的物件可以被視為藝術作品（而因此身價倍增）？又，如果真的可以，為何他要把這個東西給我？當這樣的交涉過程發生在某些貧窮的地方，而人們過著被剝削的生活時，就更加讓人不安了。在這些情況下，我沒辦法把我的頭埋到沙子裡假裝藝術和這個世界是分開的，而這也是為何我想要在「有機的生命裡」去實踐藝術。

呂 你把影像生產視為你自己的生活方式嗎？你似乎有這種花許多年去完成、並不必然結束或停止一件作品創作的傾向。拿《法蘭斯·李斯特廣場》（2001-）來說，你想要測試心像的生產可如何戰勝你對媒介知識的信用疑慮，因此你花了很長的時間，企圖與對此廣場有所觀察的人們溝通，即使你一



《法蘭斯·李斯特廣場》，2001-  
電腦繪圖、錄像裝置、手繪稿、紙模型、  
文字等



*Place Franz Liszt*, 2001-  
computer generated images, video installations,  
drawings, paper models, texts...

次也沒有去過那裡。憑此你給了自己一個非常強勢的「想像」位置去完全從你個人心裡去描繪一個地方。在這件作品裡，影像生產是一個想像力的物質化過程，最終成為一個複雜的多媒體裝置。在《邦納鎮》這個動畫影像作品裡，你回溯你的童年回憶，也可以說這是一種調查回憶之物質性的作品。你在這些影像生產實驗的過程裡有什麼新的理解，他們又如何——在如此複雜的回憶、想像、影像生產的矩陣裡，回頭影響你的觀點？為何你一直選擇將自己放置在作品裡的主人翁的位置上，以第一人稱的方式來進行實驗，建立影像生產與現實生產之間的幻象？這些實驗對你作為一位藝術家的影像力和後作用是什麼？你會覺得自己像是活在一個虛構世界裡嗎？如果有的話，那是誰的敘事呢？

**布** 我作品真的包括影像生產嗎？有趣的是我並不這麼認為。

對我來說，我許多作品都是公然地破壞圖像、偶像。也就是說，我當然認為我的創作，尤其是那些長期性的作品，是一種生活方式。或許這是為何我無法從影像生產的角度來看待，而是一種更普遍性的生產狀態。我的作品沒有辦法從我的生活中抽離；具體地說，更像經驗這樣的概念。一開始可能甚至稱不上是一種藝術性立場，我只是跟著一種或許很幼稚的直覺：我不想過一種「正常的」生活，早上起床去辦公室為了要「有一份工作」。我不是在稱頌懶惰，因為我的計畫通常相當耗時，而可以說我幾乎沒有什麼休閒時間。我只是不想要我心裡的「存在性」部分必須要開開關關。你知道，當第一次讀到馬克思說勞動分工也將導致勞動者自身的疏離時的震驚。當我更年輕時，我受擾的直覺把此字面意義當真，而我只想要保持完整的人性！長久以來，人們將藝術視為一種規訓學習，但是我相信操作形式只是一個自然功能，像是呼吸、睡覺或思考。我對那些活得像是企業家一樣的藝術家感到同情，他們為了要讓生意持續而創作，卻忘了藝術正是不對生命作出斷言的托辭。因此，《邦納鎮》是我處理回憶的特殊方式，《法蘭斯·李斯特廣場》或《目擊者》是我透過證據所得到的事實等等。由於他們並無法抽離一種持續的經驗狀態，我很難分析我分別從這些實驗上獲得什麼學習。《邦納鎮》是蠻有趣的例子，多數看過影片的人會想像我在一種懷舊而憂傷的情感裡去追憶我的故鄉，片子緩慢而安靜。但事實上，製作這影片卻抹去我的回憶。至少，那些畫面介入我和我的記憶之間，而當我要回想我的後院或學校時，是


影片裡白色的、空白的影像浮現在我心裡。《邦納鎮》真正成為一種螢幕回憶。

可說我的作品是一種虛構化的過程，但這並非通則。相反的，我認為藝術是面對現實的有力工具。我有個兄弟是生物學家，總在處理圖像，而我常以為我們做的事情差不多。他設立一些通訊協定可幫助他將一個不可見的問題視覺化，例如像是一個脆弱的動脈。他所生產的影像並非現實自身，或是新浪潮電影大師高達所說的，它們不止是一些影像，它們就只是一些影像。但是妳不會說他活在一個虛構的世界吧？我認為我的例子也是一樣。

妳另外提到關於我作為第一人稱或是主人翁這點，對我來說很重要，幾乎是我作品裡面最主要的關注。我希望我能解釋更多，但我還只是在跟著直覺發展一些什麼，我自己都還搞不清楚。讓我這麼說吧，我想重新定義主體狀態。這在西方文化傳統裡實在是一項非常大膽甚至矯情做作的任務。我所指的「主體」是哲學意義上，特別是笛卡爾式的定義：先驗主體是西方社會的精神特質。我認為這概念由於暗示了一種二分化的假設，而導致對生命和現實的扭曲觀點，我不再贅言嘮叨，不過，我的工作方式與此有關。我試圖找到與現實的適切距離。這是我近年常去日本的原因，在日文裡，主詞可以被省略，而這對於一個想要擺脫我思故我在、理想主義、所有沉重的哲學包袱的法國人來說，簡直是一個出乎意料以外的真相。對主體中心的一般西方人來說，這不容易理解，他們只能看到人或主體性的缺席。但現實中，文法上的

主詞是無用的，因為已內含其中。我很喜歡日文裡只能說「他看起來很傷心」，不能說「他很傷心」，因為畢竟你不在別人腦袋裡，無法得知他人的感受。你只能描述事物的外觀，從你個人特殊的觀點來談。在法國，50年代時曾有「新小說」這樣的文體來進行這個方向的一些嘗試，但是他們必須要違逆他們的語言和文化來進行寫作。而日語則本身就這樣發展的，俳句裡也看得到。西方人耽溺於主體，二分法讓他再進而宣稱客觀性，而日文中，先驗的主體性雖不存在，一個想法、言說卻需要被「置於」某處（誰說的？從哪裡來？）。主體性在此並非目的，也非到達目的之工具，而是事實。在哥白尼將地球去中心化、達爾文將人類去中心化、弗洛伊德將意識去中心化後，每個人依舊在哲學上是自我中心的，說白點，他就是他認知宇宙的中心。

或許看起來我被這些說法給岔開主題，然而它們和我想要在一種自我耽溺與脫離現實的想法間找到一個好的媒介有關係。我認為這在全球化的時代裡是十分重要的。從在地到全球，我們似乎都沒有選擇地去仰賴更多既有的模式，因為我們所要處理的事情太多也太複雜了。從一種實用主義的宏觀角度來看，這些我們生產的模式是有效率的，但是從個體尺度來看，我們很難從這些簡化的再現現實去理解他們所真正代表的意義，我們物理經驗的在地環境和我們從這些模式裡學習來的全球脈絡之間並不真正具有連續性。身為藝術家、公民，我對此的回應是將這些模式放到現實中裡再度測試，透過自身的經歷來回答。



《目擊者》9號（東京來的棒球）· 2012

Aera 雜誌內頁剪報、棒球

Joseph Kouli 收藏

*Témoign #9 (Baseball from Tokyo), 2012*

page of the magazine *Aera* and baseball

Joseph Kouli collection

**Maybe the true life is elsewhere,  
but the fact stands by me and my body...**



**EL** When I first saw your work *Les Témoins*, I thought you must be a paranoid, stubborn old fellow. What kind of person on this earth would look for things pitched in the news media for real, risking much time and resources to fetch objects from pictures on the other side of the planet? Later I had the opportunity to meet you on a studio visit and you walked me through your works, and then I was immediately blown away by the freshness of your various interrogations on the nature of image—from its attitude, functions, materiality to its relation with memories and credibility in reality. It was, for me, like a rare experience to see things again from a child's mind, like a stop from being numb about what it takes and means to live in a society of the spectacle. The purity and curiosity in your artistic intents and exploration inspires me, and I am curious if you remember how you experienced the world of imagery or media when you were a kid, and if there is any special account of it that leads you to your artistic practice. Or, may I know what is your biggest frustration or fantasy in experiencing images?

**BB** To be honest, I wish I were a paranoid old fellow! I am one of these artists who dreams of going out of art, because I believe in the beauty of “pure acts”. Think about Marina Abramović's silent sitting. If she was, say, a scrivener who suddenly gave in to a genuine impulse and stopped working to spend entire days just staring at strangers, I think it would be an astonishing act. It would be unexpected and gratuitous. It wouldn't seek any validation from society. But Marina

Abramović is a performance artist and this context destroys part of the beauty of her action by justifying it. In a way, it is as rational for a performance artist to sit silently on a chair for hours or to stand naked on a hallway as it is for a scrivener to copy legal documents. The same thing is true with my own work *Les Témoins*. I wish it were the act of a genuine human being trying to fulfill an existential need. But I am also an artist and, whether I like it or not, this position transforms the meaning of my act.



《目擊者》9號（東京來的棒球）· 2012  
Aera 雜誌內頁剪報· 棒球  
Joseph Kouli 收藏

*Témoïn #9 (Baseball from Tokyo), 2012*  
Page of the magazine *Aera* and baseball  
Joseph Kouli collection

So, I'm glad that you speak about the "purity" of my intents, even if they are actually mixed! As you guessed, my particular attitude towards the media dates back to my childhood. When I was a kid, I lived in a small town in the French Alps. It was a real hole and it was surrounded by the mountains so I felt I was cut off from the rest of the world, or more exactly that "true life was elsewhere", just as Rimbaud stated. So, I soon developed ambivalent feelings about the media. It was very important for me because it was a link to what I considered a "truer" reality but it was also a big frustration to only see the world from a distance. Images were vital, yet they were not enough. Instead of fulfilling my curiosity, they made me want to experience the real thing. At that time, I also became aware that images produced by the artists were different because they were not just a promise but a world within itself. My work *Les Témoins* is clearly a long-range response to this old feeling.

Speaking about my "biggest frustrations", there is also an anecdote I would like to tell you. When I was very young, around 4 or 5 years old maybe, I had a very strange dream. I was in a blank space and there was a big white sheet of paper levitating in front of me. I "drew" on this paper, but not with pencils or pens. The paper was a kind of gate between my mind and the external world. Everything I imagined transformed itself, through the paper, into real tangible objects. As you can imagine, it was a very nice dream, and I was very sad when I woke up! In fact I was so disappointed that this dream has pursued me all

my life and I seriously think that a good part of my work is an attempt to restore it!

**EL** It is truly amazing to hear this personal story from you, and I feel that this dream and your childhood experience with the media can explain well how I sense that innocence in your work. Well, but you are right that your artistic position transforms the meaning of your act, and also indicates how the art institution endorses your practice and we could call it art. In this case, how do you justify or compromise yourself to work around your artist position? Do you ever imagine how it would be if you had a different approach rather than being a professional artist and still did the same thing to fulfill your existential needs?

**BB** I think it's more complicated than it seems. By "innocence" or "pure act" I mean a state in which one is fully absorbed by what he is doing, without letting any ulterior motive or incidental thought interfere. This view is quite similar to that of Zen Buddhism that the anthropologist Ruth Benedict described as a way to detach oneself from the "observing self". Dogen, the great monk from the 13th century said about his illumination: "I learned that eyes are horizontal, nose is vertical." Likewise, tea master Sen no Rikyu told people who asked about the very essence of his art: "First you boil water, then you make the tea and drink it." These revelations are so disarmingly simple that one could believe that, after all, expertise is an obstacle and that

the best way to achieve illumination and become a tea master is to never meditate or practice the tea ceremony. But paradoxically this simplicity can only be achieved through a long learning process. The idiot and the wise man look the same but their senses of innocence are symmetrical. I think that's exactly the same thing with non-art. For me, Alan Kaprow looks like Sen no Rikyu when he invents a sort of "way of tooth brushing" (*in Art which can't be art*, 1986). Just like it takes a tea master to prepare some tea artlessly, it takes an artist to feel the call of the non-art. So, fantasizing about the non-art is very interesting and stimulating but one must not forget that it is a perpetually receding horizon, a mirage that can only be seen from a distance, which is from the specific field of art. I can contemplate a sort of guerilla strategy where my practice would be pursued outside of an artistic context, the way Alan Kaprow imagined it in his "Education of the Un-Artist" but, in the end, this exit from art in the aim of art would be but an art that dares not tell its name.

Moreover, consider the question the other way around—the fact that the context of my action contributes to its meaning is very important for me. I disagree with the idealist conception that considers art as a privileged field, detached from other human activities. It is easy and flattering for the artist who works in the solitude of his studio to consider that he is face to face with the Absolute, the Truth or the Beauty and that the reception of his work, its becoming-merchandise is comfortably left up to his gallery, are only contingent aspects, some

sort of secularization. On the contrary, I consider that art, just like any other activity, depends on a web of interdependents and that thus there is no art without a system of art that, to speak like Alfred Gell, involves not only the artist himself but a chain of agents. Parodying Maurice Denis, I could say that a picture, before being a flat surface covered with colors assembled in a certain order, is essentially an artefact, identified as art by a given society and, for this reason, invested with the use, exchange, and symbolic values peculiar to this field.

In light of the founding dream I described, it is no surprise that I consider works of art as objectivized thoughts. With art, something that is usually immaterial, intellectual, becomes a tangible thing, a thing that can be shown, that can pass from hand to hand, that can be transformed, that can be debated. For me, this capacity to circulate is far more than a secondary property, it is the true purpose of art objects. Duchamp, when he submitted *Fountain* for the exhibition of the Society of Independent Artists in 1917, was maybe the first artist to create a work whose value was no longer in its intrinsic qualities but in the interaction it provoked. He “played” art just as he used to play chess. The urinal itself was a piece he moved on the art field as chessboard and he forced members of the society to enter the game and deal with his attack. Like many artists, I am Duchamp’s heir, but my position differs from his in several aspects. First—maybe that’s an effect of globalization?—I want my playground to be the entire world and the agents I interact with not only curators, artists or critics

but also a salary man from Tokyo, a tuk-tuk driver from Thailand or a cow boy from Colorado. For, and that's the important point, I want my work to be dialogical right from the beginning. Duchamp made do with the traditional two-step artist-viewer relationship. In the case of *Fountain*, he proposed the work and then the committee reacted. With my work *Les Témoins*, I try to make the participation of the agents part of the "becoming-art" process itself. When I contact the owner of an object I am interested in, I tell him I want it to become a piece of art but he is given the choice to decide on the validity of this request. In what respect can this trivial item be considered a work of art (and thus dramatically increase its value)? And if it really can be, why should he give it to me? This sort of negotiation becomes somewhat unsettling when the investigation takes place in very poor surroundings and involves people who live in deprivation. In these situations, I can't bury my head in the sand and behave as if art was separated from the rest of the world but that's why I want to do art "in vivo".



《法蘭斯·李斯特廣場》· 2001-  
電腦繪圖、錄像裝置、手繪稿、紙模型、文字等  
展覽裝置現場 · Caixa Forum · 巴塞隆納

*Place Franz Liszt*, 2001-  
Computer generated images, video installations, drawings, paper models, texts...  
Exhibition view at Caixa Forum, Barcelona

**EL** Do you regard image production as a way of living for you? It seems you have this tendency to develop projects that take years to accomplish and do not necessarily end. *Place Franz Liszt* (2001-) is an example. You wanted to test how mental image generation can unravel your troubles in giving credit to the mediated knowledge, and you spent a long time trying to communicate with people who have observations on this place where you had never been yourself. From here, you gave yourself a very powerful position of “imagination” to depict a place from your mind. In this piece, the image production that eventually becomes a complex multimedia installation is a process of materialization of imagination. In *Bonneville*, an animation video that traces back your childhood memory is, in a way, made to investigate the materiality of memories. What kind of understandings have you learned from these experiments of image production, and how they influence your perception in return—through such complex matrices of memory, imagination and image production? Why do you always choose to put yourself in the position of protagonist in your work, as the first narrator in an experiment, to construct a seamless illusion between the production of image and the production of reality? What are the after-effects of these experiments on you as an artist? Do you feel like you live in a fictional world instead, and if so, by whose narration?

**BB** Does my work really consist of producing images? That’s funny because I don’t see it this way. For me, many of my projects are even



blatantly iconoclast. That said, I definitely regard them—and more specifically the long-term ones—as ways of living. Maybe that’s precisely the reason why I can’t consider them from the angle of image production and more generally of production. For me, my work is inextricable from my life and, if I had to characterize it, I would rather focus on the notion of experience. At the beginning, it wasn’t even an artistic stance, I was just following an instinct one would consider childish: I didn’t want to live a “normal” life, to wake up in the morning to go to an office, to just “have a job”. It’s not that I was praising laziness, in fact most of my projects were already time consuming and I was having the exact same problem with the concept of leisure. I just didn’t want the “existential” part of my mind to be alternately switched on and off. You know, it struck me when I first read what Marx said about the division of labor leading to the division of the worker himself. I was younger then and it put my confused intuitions into words. I just wanted to remain an entire human being! Because it has a long history, people tend to see art as a discipline but I truly believe that manipulating forms is just a natural function, just like breathing, sleeping or thinking. I pity the artists who live like entrepreneurs, who produce things because they need to get the business going, while art is the perfect alibi to not to predicate one’s life.

So, in a way, *Bonneville* is my own special way of dealing with memory, *Place Franz Liszt* or *Les Témoins* with the fact that there are things that I only know through testimonies, and so on. Therefore, it’s

not easy to tell what lessons I learnt from these experiments because they are not dissociated from a continuous experience. The case of *Bonneville* is interesting though. People who see the video usually imagine that I am in a nostalgic or melancholic mood about it because it is about my hometown and it is slow and silent but in reality, working on this video, somehow erased my memory. At least, the drawings interposed themselves between me and my remembrances to the point that when I think about my courtyard or my school it's the black and white images of the video that come to my mind. *Bonneville* literally became a screen memory.

In this sense, one can regard my work as a process of fictionalization but this is definitely not a general rule. On the contrary, I see art as a powerful tool to deal with reality. I've got a brother who is a biologist and works in imaging and I have always thought that we do the same thing in a way. He sets up protocols that help visualize an invisible problem like, say, an arterial fragility. The images he produces are not reality itself or, as filmmaker Jean-Luc Godard would say, they are not some just images, they are just some images. But you wouldn't say that he lives in a fictional world, would you? I don't see any difference with my own case.

The other point that you raised about me being the first narrator or the protagonist is very important to me. It is tending towards becoming one of the main concerns in my work. I wish I was able to explain it but I'm just at the beginning of something, following intuitions.

Things are still unclear. Let's just say that I would like to redefine the status of the subject. That's a very audacious or pretentious task, knowing the importance of this concept in Western cultures! I mean "subject" in the philosophical—and more precisely Cartesian sense: the transcendental subject that is the keystone of the Western ethos. My opinion is that this concept leads to a distorted perception of life and reality, mainly because it implies a dualistic postulate. It would be tedious to enter into the details, but my approach has something to do with focus. I try to find the right distance to reality. This is the reason why I have often gone to Japan in the past few years. A language in which subjects can be dropped out—what a revelation for a French guy who wants to get free from the cogito, the idealism and all old philosophical paraphernalia! It is such a difficult thing to understand from a subject-focused point of view that the average Westerner can only see it as a negation of the person or of subjectivity. But in reality, the grammatical subject is useless because it is implicit. I really like the fact that, in Japanese, you cannot say something like "he is sad" but only "he looks sad" because, after all, you are not in his head and you don't know how he feels. You can only express how things appear from the outside, from your specific point of view. In France, some attempts were made in this direction in the 50's with the "Nouveau roman" but then the writers needed to write against their language and culture whereas the Japanese language is made for this kind of construction, which is very visible in haiku. To sum up, the Westerner

who is obsessed by the subject allows himself to claim objectivity because the dualism in his approach leads him to do so, while for the Japanese, although he disagrees with the idea of a transcendental subject, a thought or a speech is necessarily "situated". (Who speaks? And where from?) Subjectivity in this case is not a goal, it is not even a means to a goal; it is just a fact. Even after Copernicus decentered the planet Earth, after Darwin decentered the human species and after Freud decentered consciousness itself, each human being remains, physiologically speaking, egocentric, in the literal sense that he is the center of his perceived universe.

It may seem that I am digressing but these points are closely linked to my own effort to strike a happy medium between self-absorbed and disembodied points of view. I think this concern is particularly important today, at a time of globalization. Moving from local to global, it seems that we have no choice but to rely more and more on models because the things we have to deal with are becoming too numerous and too complex. From a purely pragmatic point of view and at large scale, the models we generate are very effective. But on an individual scale, it proves very difficult to match these simplified representations with the realities they are supposed to stand for because there is a lack of continuity between the local environment we experience physically and the global context we are supposed to take into account but only know through models. My answer as an artist but also as a citizen is to put these models to the test of reality, by experiencing them by myself.



《金邊街頭的陽傘》· 2012  
影像截取· 錄像 50'

*The Sun Umbrella of Phnom Penh, 2012*  
Still image, video, 50'

物非物 訪談系列

在有機的生命裡：伯諾瓦·布洛伊薩特訪談錄

展覽

物非物 2014 年 10 月 10 日至 11 月 9 日

台北國際藝術村·台北市北平東路 7 號

主編 呂岱如

英文編輯 Jennifer Caroline Ellis

中文編輯 甄靜妍

美術設計 吳國強

翻譯 呂岱如

文章版權 伯諾瓦·布洛伊薩特、呂岱如

圖片版權 伯諾瓦·布洛伊薩特

版權所有 馬凌畫廊

出版日期 2014 年 10 月

香港中環皇后大道中 8 號 1 樓

電話 +852 2810 0317 | 傳真 +852 2810 0311

Never odd or eveN Interview Series

In vivo: an interview with Benoît Brouisat

Exhibition

Never odd or eveN, Oct 10 to Nov 9, 2014

Taipei Artist Village, 7 Beiping East Road, Taipei

Editor Esther Lu

English Copyediting Jennifer Caroline Ellis

Chinese Copyediting Christine Yan

Graphic Design Ralph Kuo Chiang Wu

Translation Esther Lu

© October 2014 Edouard Malingue Gallery

Copyrights of the text are reserved for authors, of the images for Benoît Brouisat

Published by Edouard Malingue Gallery

First Floor, 8 Queen's Road Central, Hong Kong

T +852 2810 0317 | F +852 2810 0311

[www.edouardmalingue.com](http://www.edouardmalingue.com)

伯諾瓦·布洛伊薩特，藝術家，現居巴黎

Benoît Broisat is an artist based in Paris

**benoit.broisat.free.fr**

呂岱如，策展人，現居台北

Esther Lu is a curator based in Taipei

物非物 訪談系列  
Never odd or eveN Interview Series

EDOUARD MALINGUE GALLERY