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See fig. 23.1, Conway Mordaunt Shipley, *Chinese and Western Ships in Singapore Harbour* (1854).

These words, which have been engraved upon the green, brown and off-white surfaces of Simryn Gill’s installation, *Washed Up* (1993–1995, fig. 23.2), were, according to the artist, randomly compiled. Yet, they are deeply suggestive, as is the knowledge of whence these otherwise prosaic shards have been gathered—beaches of Singapore since reclaimed and areas of Port Dickson in Malaysia under redevelopment—intimating their having been swept to shore by unseen currents. Typifying the material and method employed by Gill, of registering the ebb and flow of a universe of objects and of understanding through found matter that has included stones, shells and circular things, these travel-worn fragments may be said to embody the subject of this essay: the global.

The term, global, has become ubiquitous and would appear to also be central to Singapore and the exposition of its past, such as has been documented in *Singapore: A 700-Year History, From Early Emporium to World City*. Written by Kwa Chong Guan, Derek Heng and Tan Tai Yong, this expansive history published in 2009 was manifest as an exhibition at the National Museum of Singapore in 2014. Whereas the exhibition emphasised the narrative of the development of the modern state, noting its gestation in 1299, with the renaming
of the island to Singapura by Sri Tri Buana (also known as Sang Nila Utama), and elaborating, in increasing detail as it progressed into the recent half-century, the genealogical rise of the nation, the intent of the publication that had been commissioned by the National Archives was, one might say, rather more “global.” It was to locate present-day (21st century) global and economic “aspirations” as having been established in the early maritime history of the Melaka Straits, thereby nominating this disposition for exchange in a continuous trajectory from pre-colonial emporium to the present as the island state’s destiny. It goes without saying that an affirmation of a “natural” propensity for being global is advantageous to the national narrative, and this advantage extends to its cultural capital, that, as Lily Kong’s study suggests, provides strategic edge for the aspiring global city.

For the aesthetic interpretation, however, the global is not merely significant in a historical capacity. It also articulates the definition of the contemporaneity of art, for Singapore and also the region.

In 1993, in conjunction with the first Asia Pacific Triennial of Contemporary Art, the Queensland Art Gallery published Tradition and Change: Contemporary Art of Asia and the Pacific. Within her editorial introduction, Caroline Turner defined the contemporary as “a product of tradition, historical cultural encounters, the confrontation with the West in more modern times, and the recent economic, technological and information changes which have pushed the world towards a ‘global’ culture.” Charting this contemporary turn, the essays following her overview highlighted the Indonesian New Art Movement (Gerakan Seni Rupa Baru) in the 1970s, neo-regionalist tendencies from the early 1980s in Malaysia, syncretic absorption concurrent with tumultuous politics in Thailand through the 1960s and 1970s, and, for Singapore, an alterity in the late 1980s defined by genre-crossing, multidisciplinary and multicultural approaches which were signposted by the beginning of The Artists Village and The Space exhibition of 1992. Within these essays, the contemporary condition was observed in critical reflections on the topics of postcoloniality, nation and identity, which were addressed as response or counterpoint in a “paradoxical” struggle to find footing between the global and the regional, after and alongside Internationalism, resulting in “an appropriate starting point for new definitions of national and cultural identity.” Yet, in the case of Singapore, as T.K. Sabapathy was to remark, this struggle was produced less in grand gestures than in an accumulation of aesthetic negotiations across multiple instances. According to him, alterity as response and critique of cultural, social and political circumstance, was, more often than not, “circumspect” and implied, rather than professed; not to mention, it was also “entangled” with the very establishment it was to resist.

Now, Sabapathy’s observation of the alterity of the late 1980s may be brought into relation with other defining moments of the contemporary. As noted by Peter Osborne, three oft-cited markers of the contemporary in aesthetic interpretation are: post-war or post-1945 formalism; the post-conceptual turn of around the 1960s; and neoliberal globalisation of capital or post-1989. Certainly one might chart the efficacy of each juncture for a particular historical discussion of aesthetic contemporaneity. But in the context of this exposition on the global in relation to the contemporary, as suggested by both Osborne’s third juncture that coincides with Singapore’s narrative of the contemporary, as well as the island state’s 700-year historical narrative, it is proposed that the entanglement which Sabapathy puts forward may be expanded in an observation of contemporaneity of art in Singapore in relation to the subject of capital—not only in its expression in commodification, but also in tenet and foundation. Further examining this entanglement of the global with capital and the nation-state in
Interrupt

Just as one imagines Gill’s fragments as having been carried upon waves from one shore to another, Tang Mun Kit’s emergence into the aesthetic realm was marked by a drifting, this time of the artist, that would lead to a process of recovery. Tang’s sculptures are the restitution of his publicly abandoned finds, extending the life of apparently exhausted objects in new form, such as in his Bomb Sculpture series of 1991 (figs. 23.3 and 23.4). To produce this series, two chandelier medallions found cast aside were split, reshaped and washed over with dye, acrylic, enamel and varnish by Tang, to re-emerge as allegories of redemption and overcoming in the Nietzschean sense, both for the object and for the artist. Common to Gill’s ocean-crossing shards and the spoils of Tang’s wanderings is a movement and flow that the global encapsulates as its “logic.” As noted by Prasenjit Duara, the “strategies for capital accumulation” are “primarily deterritorialising”—a course that the island nation has, without doubt, benefitted substantially in the provisions of port facilities and services. Such a gambit might be said to have been performed in the production of these artworks; though, interestingly, in a doubling of deterritorialisation—appropriating materials and objects already displaced. As Tang was to elaborate in conversation with Sabapathy, the found object is the “first stimulus for the concept, the idea, the thought process,” and thus a “starting point” for the aesthetic mediation.

Whereas aesthetic mediation is visible in Washed Up and Bomb Sculpture in the artists’ mark and modification, in the case of M. Faizal Fadil’s installation, Study of Three Thermos Flasks (1991, fig. 23.5), it is the lack of such intervention that is its most compelling feature. Presented at the 2nd National Sculpture Exhibition at the National Museum Art Gallery, the artwork assembled three grey metal flasks (obtained from a street market on Sungei Road, which was popular as a site for the exchange of the used or unwanted), with evidence of past utility in plain sight, in the assortment of dents and one flask having even lost its lid. Various interpretations of conceptualist extensions or as ready-mades, Faizal’s Study was to court a measure of controversy over “the relationship between artistic design, fabrication or craft,” and was also to become ensnared by a charge of plagiarism levelled at the artwork when brought into comparison with a painting of three flasks from the year before produced by Khairul Anwar, incidentally, a friend of Faizal’s. Paradoxically, these two contentions may be said to controvert each other: as the unaestheticised object, Study could not be accused of imitation in representation; and aestheticised, one might interpret the work as Faizal’s substitution of the material form for Khairul’s representational one. In the absence of overt aesthetic intervention, Study may have appeared taciturn, but it disclosed most vividly the circulatory flows of the global in moving from a utilitarian circuit to a cultural one, particularly when it was to become part of the National Collection.

Within the artworks of Gill, Tang and Faizal, the flow and access that characterise globalisation are registered in displacement and trace. That is, in a presentation of the suspension or interruption of movement and flow (inasmuch as another flow, aesthetic circulation, takes its place), with the aesthetic act providing, in Duara’s sense, the opportunity for reassessing the “rationalising process” of modernity and, thus, its critique.
Disjunction

Certainly, in itself, critique is not limited to the contemporary. However, the proposition of contemporaneity is that the subject of critique—globalisation and its effects—may be said to be particular of its time. Duara’s critique of ecological sustainability in the wake of globalisation is a case in point, and his exposition, *The Crisis of Global Modernity*, presents the return to Asia’s past as a suggested corrective to the global problem of “human overreach in the conquest by man of nature.”

Duara is not alone in observing the limits of globalisation; his perspective is shared by Dani Rodrik in a sober reminder of the vulnerability of globalisation as phenomenon, citing globalisation’s collapse in 1914 in his examination of the “global paradox” of economics, or the truth of its precariousness; as well as by Jørgen Ørstrøm Møller who cautions the “dangerous stand” of a globalisation “taken for granted.”

Whilst such assertions have become increasingly commonplace and pointed in the contemporary, this reflexive perspective had surfaced in artworks in the 1990s, where, in relation to the subject of sustainability, one recalls Tang Da Wu’s *Tiger’s Whip* (1991, fig. 23.6). Comprising performances at the former National Museum Art Gallery, and in public spaces in Chinatown and Marina Square, *Tiger’s Whip* was intended to draw attention to the Chinese custom of employing tiger penises for aphrodisiac use as, effectively, destroying the species.

From Tang’s perspective, as it was presented in his artwork and performance, it would appear that the cultural system and its realities have become disjointed, and, drawing from Duara’s exposition, this may be understood in terms of the inherent duality of the “logic of culture”—as both culture in its everyday thrust in activity, interaction, and relationships; and as Culture in its systematised and institutionalised sense of “a representation” that lends “distinctiveness and authenticity,” not to mention, continuity.

Commended then by Sabapathy for its “risky” confrontation of fellow citizens and, concomitantly, of his own received cultural background and its values, Tang’s ten white-linen-and-wire-mesh tigers, representing their spirits having passed on, may be seen as speaking not only to the issue of the depletion of the species, but also to this duality and to the compounding effect of Culture and cultural practices under globalisation.

A similar cleft, though on a personal level, is presented in Amanda Heng’s *Another Woman* (1996–1997, fig. 23.7). Produced as a means to
reconnect with her mother, within the 14-image photographic installation (which also included sculptural forms made from outfits worn by the two that were starched stiff), the artist and her mother are seen in a variety of interactions: in an embrace, in tandem, alongside, facing, touching, holding, and across a dinner table. Another Woman has been read as the bridging of a generational gap, filtered through the condition of being female, with Ushiroshoji Masahiro noting at the artwork's 1999 presentation for the inaugural Fukuoka Asian Art Triennale that, in representing the “smallest unit” of community, Another Women was critical in its restoration of hope for, what seemed at that time, a bleak period. But beyond personal and affective reconnection, significantly, Another Woman presents another reconciliation: the culture–Culture divide that Duara speaks of.

This other reconciliation within Another Woman is of Heng with her Cultural heritage as idealised and mediated by her mother. With migration and modernisation, the experiences of Heng and her mother were worlds apart as the artist was growing up in Singapore, not least exacerbated by the linguistic divide that separated them, with her mother speaking a dialect in which Heng was not fluent. Yet, in the performed interaction, as well as its form of the image, no words are needed and, instead, mother and daughter appear as if reflections in a mirror. In Jacques Lacan’s description of the mirror stage of identification, the reflection acts as the “root-stock of secondary identifications” which simultaneously “fixes” the image of the self. Read back into Another Woman, through its representation of mirroring, the culture–Culture divide would appear to also be reconciled, the representation of this culminating in the suturing of their separate worlds within the iconic image with the greatest contact and thus its resolution: when the two embrace. This embrace was re-enacted in 2014 as the artwork, Twenty Years Later, that in image is almost identical to the one from Another Woman, excepting natural changes of the human form with the passage of time.

Whereas in Heng’s act the culture–Culture divide is palpable in the physical distance and distinctions between the artist and her mother—even as they touched—in Lee Wen’s negotiation of this divide, overt disparity would appear reduced as the artist covered his own body with yellow paint. Though, perhaps, as a result, it was also a fissure and variance more intimately felt. Beginning as a response to having been frequently mistaken for a mainland Chinese citizen during his time in London, and manifesting first as a painting in 1990, titled, Yellow Man, Where Are You Going?, Lee Wen’s exploration of cultural identity in a global context resulted a number of performances between 1992 and 2001. Appearing to satirise the ide-
alisation of Culture in Duara’s sense, the irony of assuming superficial enhancement in order to confront this cultural conundrum was not lost on the artist. As Lee Wen was to comment self-deprecatingly in his performance in 1993, succinctly capturing this disjunct: “You’re already yellow, why do you still paint yourself yellow?!”

Particularly historic amongst these performances was Journey of a Yellow Man No. 11: Multi-Culturalism (1997, fig. 23.8) which comprised a presentation that concluded with a performance. Enacted during The Substation’s SeptFest Art Conference, “Multi-culturalism: In Practice and on Paper,” Journey of a Yellow Man No. 11 was a critique of the aesthetic conservatism of the time, exemplified by the national art exhibition, Singapore Art 97, with its display of predominantly watercolour and Chinese paintings, and calligraphic works. However, it is noted that the exhibition’s 3D section—its panel chaired by Brother Joseph McNally—did include a mechanical moving-image installation, namely, Ming Wong’s Green Snake produced with Tim Thornton, which referenced the operatic classic, Madame White Snake. But this was an exception. Reading the source of the limits of the exhibition as symptomatic of “an obsessive preoccupation with ethnicity,” the artist presented his performative artwork as addressing the reality of the global condition in a self-conscious problematisation of identity “with a loud, pronounced yellow.” Yet, as he was to reflexively demonstrate to humorous effect, this identity was also “tenuous” by submerging his painted body into a tub of water, and offering his audiences the bottled bathwater, yellow from having been used to sluice off this “identity,” and announcing, “Now I am a watercolourist too!”

Yellow, not yellow enough, or too yellow—the aim of the performance would appear to be the presentation of the cultural dilemma, rather than its resolution; as Lucy Davis was to comment, Lee Wen’s embodiment of the essentialist definition of his identity in this performance was “only part successful,” its “promise of change […] abandoned half way.” But, perhaps, what is revealed in these reflections on the disjunctions of the global condition, noting what it is, rather than what it is assumed or prescribed to be—through Tang’s tiger caught between continuity of Culture and its corporeal end, Heng’s desire for familial reconnection, and Lee Wen’s unsettled embodiment—is that the foundation of the global, nation, is itself not untroubled.

Limits

The outlook of nation under the pressures of global forces do not appear all too favourable; as Møller describes, the nation state is “no longer jeune premier,” “performing the dying
swan—sometimes with very little grace, but no other role is available in the script of history.”

The waning of nation may, however, not come entirely as a surprise given its constitution, having emerged in “the volatile tension between its globality and its nationness” as a result of 19th-century globalisation, which was, effectively, an exercise of power and empire. It is for reason of “managing” this inherent “tension” between nation and global desires that Rodrik suggests the necessity of choosing two of three options in globalisation’s “trilemma”—hyperglobalisation, democracy and the nation.

A similar sacrifice is suggested by Duara to alleviate the crisis of sustainability, though, in a “holism” of authority as a “modern universalism” via the “revisit [of] the alternative traditions from China and India,” to transcend nation in its basis of a “tribal self-other distinction.” Such a scenario by way of aesthetic response, engaging too with the subject of transcendence in a convergence of contrasting forces and aesthetic approaches, may be said to have been the subject of the seminal exhibition, *Trimurti*, presented at the Goethe Institut in 1988 by artists S. Chandrasekaran, Goh Ee Choo and Salleh Japar.

*Trimurti* was conceived around the time of other initiatives such as The Artists Village—considered by Chandrasekaran as based on “Western-oriented concepts” relative to *Trimurti*—as well as the sprawling and participatory exhibition, *More than 4*, by Tang Mun Kit, Chng Chin Kang, Lim Poh Teck and Baet Yoke Kuan at the Botanic Gardens and the former St Joseph’s Institution before it was redeveloped into the Singapore Art Museum.

As such, *Trimurti’s* problematisation of influences and inheritances of culture and identity as its aesthetic project had company. However, *Trimurti* was also exceptional in its approach. Assuming the Sanskrit word describing the Hindu Godhead of Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva re-interpreted as three distinct forces of Creation, Preservation and Destruction that, regardless, were held in equilibrium, *Trimurti* was envisaged as “a total happening” of painting, sculptures, installation and performance.

Read as critically responding to historical experiences of the nation in its making that had necessitated the management of ethnic differences, Ahmad Mashadi was to retrospectively remark that, *Trimurti* nevertheless “[replicated] the very ideology of multiculturalism” in its
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proposition of coexistence. Yet, if considered for its transcendental approach, Trimurti might be seen as less the presentation of a tempering of contradictory forces which multiculturalism may imply, than an emphasis on a dynamism of interdependence and the problem of illusory appearances—of differences—particularly when seen in the context of Chandrasekaran’s sculpture series.

Following Trimurti, Chandrasekaran spent time in Madras learning and observing wood carving and temple architecture; his experiments culminating in his bronze sculptures, Deva Series I–IV (1994, fig. 23.9). Contrary to its title, the Deva Series approximated, rather than produced, the deified form, in a reflection on the ritual of darshan, where the form assumes godhood. In this ceremonial act, the craftsman finishes the eyes of the form he is making in a ritual that “opens” the Divine gaze. But this moment is suspended in Deva Series, even as all the trappings of body (though often lacking the head), posture, accessory, pedestal and celestial transport or vahana are reproduced. Through Deva Series, Chandrasekaran was to create a profane aesthetic that, nonetheless, appeared divine—or as his peer Swaminathan was to exclaim, “What is this, it looks like god, but it is not god!” Thus, as with Trimurti, the Deva Series may be seen as an attempt at exposing the inner workings of representation, performed through the use of familiar frame and reference.

Whilst such an approach may seem to have overtones of concession, recalling the entanglement suggested by Sabapathy, this complicity is, however, not incidental. Rather, as a collusive strategy, it is key to the artwork’s thrust as observed in Vincent Leow’s Lifestyles of the Rich and Famous: The Three-Legged Toad, with its subject, the nature of capital. Produced for The Space exhibition at Hong Bee Warehouse in 1992, central to Lifestyle was a suit and hat that Leow fabricated from photocopied reproductions of the American banknote. Donning this suit, Leow performed as a personification of the Chinese Chan Chu or prosperity charm, the toad mascot of the aspiring everyman. Hopping and leaping around while masticating and spitting the dollar notes from his mouth, Leow’s prosperous figure, apparently subsisting on and expelling wealth, was to call into question the superstitions of both currency notes and charm. Post-performance, Leow’s outfit has become a performance relic, Money Suit (1992, fig. 23.10); its enshrinement paradoxically affirming the success of its critique and its material appeal. Whereas Leow’s performance took issue with capital in its symbol of currency, the subject of capital was brought into relation with nation, in the currency of a national symbol, in Lim Tzay Chuen’s proposition for the Venice Biennale of 2005.

Crafted as a bid to bring the 80-tonne half-fish, half-feline Merlion constructed in 1972—“its upper half […] metonym [of founding myth] and its lower half metaphor [of maritime history]”—from the Marina Bay in Singapore to Venice, Italy, Lim’s proposal pushed the subject of nation within the global to its logical conclusion. That is, to assume the truth of its currency as “circulatory global resource,” which may be imported, exported and traded upon, and in no less than an exhibition about nation as global entity, the Venice Biennale. Furthermore, as a national commission, MIKE (fig. 23.11) (as the Merlion was nicknamed within Lim’s proposal) may be said to have satisfied the nation’s central need to be its own subject, putting to work the symbol of the nation’s aspirations for international recognition. However, unable to garner approvals for MIKE to make the voyage, in place of the nation signified, Lim’s exhibition presented other conventional elements of the tourist or visitor’s experience: an “informational” room, a bathroom as utilitarian rest-stop and site of other watery needs, and a sign within the pavilion’s courtyard marking the location where the Merlion would have stood had it arrived as pro-
posed. In absence it would appear that Lim’s project failed, but the crux of the proposal may be said to be in its “success” as documented in a fictitious news article included in the exhibition catalogue. In the article, “Singapore Icon Makes a Splash at Venice,” purportedly written by Cindy/Carol Vogel—the first name used in the catalogue, the second in a poster provided by the artist in 2015, though both signalling the subject of the global centres of art in referencing Carol Vogel, a veteran arts writer of *The New York Times*—Lim is quoted via a “spokesperson” as claiming that the proposal was about the fictions of nation, and the opportunity to add “more layers to the story.” It is without doubt that Lim’s proposal has added just such a layer. But the corollary of such an addition is the question of what one might find if one were to peel away these layers?

The fiction of nation is the subject of James C. Scott’s study of the peoples of the upland regions of Southeast Asia, circumscribed as Zomia—a term he attributes to Willem van Schendel, referring to the high-altitude areas crossing Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Thailand and Burma, as well as the Yunnan, Guizhou, Guangxi and Sichuan provinces of China. Within Scott’s chronicle, these Zomia communities, which operate without the structure of nation (or specifically avoiding nation’s “enclosure” of legible, taxable, assessable, confiscatable and replaceable economic activity), may be seen as the alternative to the nation-centric regionalism of Southeast Asia. Marked by their state-repelling strategies in settlement, agriculture and social structure, Scott notes that the eschewing of nation is also coded into their cosmologies and oral traditions. Handed down in “cautionary tales about hierarchy and state formation” for the Akha in the southern Yunnan and adjacent areas in Laos, Burma and Thailand, and in the rejection of history and genealogy by the egalitarian Lisu of Northern Thailand, nation and its representations has little place for these communities. In fact, in the case of the Lisu, “Lisuness” as a category exists only to outsiders. While Scott qualifies his study as a relational exposition between lowland state and hill peoples, his work presents the truth of the ideological horizon of the global and its constituent, nation. On the one hand, the ways of the peoples of Zomia may be considered an instance of heterodoxy or alterity, but on the other hand, and particularly from their perspective, such an outlook would seem natural.

**Undone**

As marker of the contemporary, identifying the global within aesthetic expression performs the task of positioning the artwork and, in aggregation, an aesthetic scene, as climacteric. Yet, as observed from these artworks—the fragment adrift, a rubble reconstituted, the reclaiming of the unwanted, the presaging of the end of culture in practice, the desire for a reconciliation that seems out of reach even as it is near, the exploration of appearances, illusions and constructed narratives—the artwork as contemporary response to the global condition appears less affirmative than chary, or, as earlier noted, “circumspect.” Though it may also be said that, in the appearance of hesitation, caution or, even, uncertainty, the artwork reveals the global condition. After all, globalisation is not just about geopolitics, it is also a discourse of interests and a way of seeing. From the artists’ perspective, it would appear that, as view, it is rather limited.

Speaking on Simryn Gill’s practice on the occasion of her exhibition at the 55th Venice Biennale for the Australian pavilion, Brian Massumi, observing how Gill’s artworks reflect her lineage and history of traversal (descendant of Sikh ex-patriots, born in Singapore pre-Federation-of-Malaysia, and then living in Australia and Malaysia), suggests that the act of collecting—which may be read in the context of this essay as a deterritorialisation and of the
displaced, in aesthetic practice as well as National Collection—is intrinsically related to origins. Though, he also notes, “an origin is by nature out of place,” and thus Gill’s assembly of objects, forms and texts illustrates our “ways of regaining our composure in the essentially out-of-place” that is our reality. Faced with the question of how and what to present in her Venetian exhibition in 2013, Massumi described Gill’s answer as the attentive act of “creative undoing,” allowing the space of the pavilion to come into its own, revealing its true nature. The same may be said of the aesthetic response to the global condition as observed in these artworks discussed: not in confrontation, nor of variance, but of a loosening of limits that, coincidentally, make these expressions truly global.
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