

Painting (in) the Anthropocene¹

Raino Isto

The Anthropocene is a term given to the chronological period of the Earth's existence in which human practices and actions substantially impact on the planet's ecosystems. In recent decades, artists around the world have attempted to draw attention to the interconnections between humans and the networks of living and nonliving entities in which they are entangled, sometimes building upon and sometimes challenging traditional modes of imaging 'the landscape.' This collection of images places Lo Ch'ing within this artistic field, investigating how his work draws attention to the situation of humans, animals, and plants—and their interdependence—in the context of global modernity.

I. Introduction

Because I... have everything to do/ with your life and death/ in the future.

—Lo Ch'ing, from "O' Panda an' Man"

My younger brother and sister ran up to me/ Arguing, "How should we write the character 'tree'?/ How many strokes?/ How difficult is it?"

—Lo Ch'ing, from "The Writing of the Character "Tree"

Scholar Joseph R. Allen has suggested that the poet-painter Lo Ch'ing's uniquely postmodern aesthetic is most evident in the artist's ironic deconstruction of linguistic and visual paradigms, in his playful synthesis of Eastern and Western poetic traditions.² This is certainly true, but the project of deconstruction in Lo Ch'ing's art is not merely one of words and images. It is also one of beings and vitalities, a project aimed at complicating the understanding of humankind's connection to the world around us. In its kaleidoscopic combination of artistic traditions, Lo Ch'ing's interpretation of the Chinese landscape tradition also serves as a critique of the global (no longer merely Western) metaphysics of environmental objectification. His art asks us to look beyond the instrumentalization of nature as a resource and to recover other ways of imagining life and change.

This essay—and the accompanying virtual gallery—invites viewers to consider Lo Ch'ing's work from the standpoint of a post-metaphysical ecocriticism, to read his postmodern tendencies as part of a broader aesthetic engagement. This engagement transcends East and West in its global significance, offering us new ways of thinking about how we live together with the multitude of entities with whom we share the world and modeling a posthuman ethics of the Anthropocene. The Anthropocene is the name commonly used to describe the era in which humanity has become the single driving force behind major environmental changes that affect the entire globe: climate change, habitat destruction, and the extinction of species, for example.³ This is the era in which we live, and it is an era that—alongside the effects of global capitalism—obliterates the geographic dichotomies that once shaped geopolitics as well as culture. It is an era in which the human and the nonhuman have become interrelated to an enormous degree, and Lo Ch'ing's art speaks to the many facets of this condition. From his ceramics illustrating the lives, affections, and desires of pandas to his paintings juxtaposing of the time of cities with the aging of great and ancient trees, Lo Ch'ing's art

forces us to move beyond our own subjectivity and occupy the position of the nonhuman in the network of contemporary life.

However, his art is no mere invitation to a naïve 'return to nature,' for the disruptive thrust operative in Lo Ch'ing's painting will not allow any such straightforward romanticization of the world around us. Even as he brings together the traditions of Chinese poetry and painting, he also speaks to the contemporary practices that threaten us and our environment. As his poem on the panda (quoted above) suggests, the nonhuman lives that surround us have everything to do with our life and death in the future. As is often the case in classical Chinese literature and art, this premise results in a certain anthropomorphization of nature: nonhuman beings become active interlocutors, seeing us, speaking to us, lulling us to sleep and awakening us. This anthropomorphization is, to a certain extent, however, necessary for *us* in turn to make ourselves one with the aesthetic subject of our contemplation. Lo Ch'ing's poems and paintings invite us to think long upon—and in thinking upon, to think *with*, to think *like*, and to *become*—birds and pandas, trees and blossoms. Here we arrive at the deeper deconstructive path of Lo Ch'ing's poem-paintings. They lead us to new kinds of thought, to animal-thought and plant-thought, to something "complicated, yet simple and clear"—life as a universal phenomenon.

This essay focuses on three themes found in Lo Ch'ing's poem-paintings included in this exhibition: (1) the figure of the panda as a reflection and critique of human community in dialogue with nonhuman elements of the environment; (2) the depiction of nonhuman temporality, which figures the passage of time as partially *interior* phenomenon rather than simply an exterior play of appearances; and (3) the often schizophrenic merger of times and spaces that belong to both the depths of the past and the dynamic tensions of the present moment. The works presented are diverse and aim—in the spirit of ecocritical ventures inspired by both Eastern and Western traditions—to broaden the understanding of our own identity and responsibilities in the emergent web of the Anthropocene.

II. The Sign of the Panda: Thinking the Nonhuman

It is interesting that one of Lo Ch'ing's statements on the panda seems—on its face—to be a sort of *rejection* of the spirit of linguistic deconstruction, appearing instead as the assertion of a fundamental *nature* that is distorted by signs. In the preface to a collection of his paintings featuring pandas, Lo Ch'ing describes the iconization of the panda bear following the World Wildlife Fund's adoption of its image as the organization's logo in the 1960s.⁴ In addition to the growth of the panda-image as a symbol of endangered species conservation, Lo Ch'ing also traces the etymology of "Xiong-mao" (bear-cat), the modern Chinese name for the animal—a name which came about following the mislabeling of a taxidermied panda displayed at the Museum of Chung-king in the 1940s. Lo Ch'ing writes, "From then on, panda has suffered a dissociation of sensibility, its name deconstructed from its nature and its form no longer the echo of its content."⁵

Here, Lo points to a complex rift endemic to the aesthetic and linguistic shift from industrial society into "the information age, ... from ... structuralist epistemologies into [the] poststructuralist recognition of free-floating signifiers."⁶ The panda bear appears in discourse and media respectively as a name ("Xiong-mao") inappropriate to its referent and a sign (the World Wildlife Fund's logo) that far exceeds the content of its referent. (It is no doubt significant that—if the anecdote is accurate—the misleading modern Chinese name for the panda appeared in relation to a *taxidermied*

animal. That is, the name referred—to revert to English etymologies—to the *arranging* or disposition of *skin*, of the *surface* of the animal.) In the end, both the sign and the name seem to tell us little about panda.

One way to read Lo Ch'ing's assertion that "the panda has suffered a dissociation of sensibility" is as a kind of modernist longing for the stability of essences. On this reading, Lo's images of pandas eating bamboo, climbing trees, and socializing represent a naïve belief in the possibility of nature-in-itself in the postmodern era. To borrow the title of one of Lo's works, they would be *Nostalgia* (2012)—gazing into a past that is now beyond recovery. As tempting as such a reading is, given the occasionally apparent sentimentality of his panda images, it is also forthrightly reductive. And in light of a consideration of Lo Ch'ing's insistence on the postmodern paradigm, such a reading is significantly unconvincing.⁷ However, we should ask: Why is it *precisely at the intersection of postmodern language and the nonhuman* that there suddenly emerges such an apparent discomfort with the dissociation of form and content, of signifier and signified? This discomfort with what the panda has suffered comes, I think, not out of an urge to dismiss or defeat the pervasive dissociation of the postmodern era. Instead, it reveals another aspect of postmodernity that has not been fully investigated in Lo Ch'ing's work: the discovery of the inscrutability of the extra-linguistic world of *things*, a world not exhausted by the vicissitudes of language in the information age.⁸

Rather than interpreting Lo Ch'ing's paintings of animals (or of plants) either as a retrograde modernist impulse at odds with his postmodern language games, or as a straightforward continuation of Chinese art's rich tradition of representing nonhuman subjects, I propose that his works should be considered from the standpoint of recent trends in object-oriented thinking and ecocritical (or 'green') materialism. This means acknowledging that amongst all things—including animals—"there is something that recedes—always hidden, inside, inaccessible," as Ian Bogost writes.⁹ In short, the postmodernist aspect of many of Lo Ch'ing's works lies in their *posthumanism*. They are committed to thinking and representing a way of being with nonhuman entities that does not privilege the human.

The posthumanist approach does not necessarily jettison anthropomorphism. As Jane Bennett (and Bogost following her) argues, anthropomorphizing can help us to understand the full implications of the *otherness* of things (be they pandas or bamboo plants) and their power. Anthropomorphizing can "highlight the common materiality of all that is" while "expos[ing us to] a wider distribution of agency" among nonhuman actors.¹⁰ Thus, the lighthearted narratives Lo Ch'ing creates with his pandas are not simply meant to 'humanize' their animal subjects, to suggest that behind their iconic faces, pandas live lives just like we do. Nor are they moralizing images that urge us to undo the 'deconstruction' of the panda. Instead, they lead us to ponder exactly how we *are* connected to pandas, and how they are connected to the world around them.

Consider, for example, works like *Climbing Up Higher and Higher* (2012) or *The More One Eats, the Tastier It Becomes* (2012). Both of these ceramic works suggest the lighthearted character of the panda, engaged in activities (climbing trees, eating bamboo shoots) that strike the viewer most immediately as carefree and even childish. However, both also depict a state of deep absorption in these activities—an absorption further reinforced by the titles given to the works, which suggest repetitive, ongoing action ('higher and higher'; 'the more one eats'). This depiction of repetitive action has a twofold effect: it both hints at the supposedly instinctual behavior of animals, which repeats according to a kind of objective necessity (for example, for food), and at the stubborn and inaccessible interiority of subjects absorbed in habitual practices. In these works, the panda as a sign

or symbol (the loveable and iconic animal that serves as the logo for the World Wildlife Fund) is juxtaposed against the panda as an animal with its own cycles of activity, sustenance, and enjoyment. Even the framing of the ceramic plate as a medium works to suggest the isolation of these vignettes, an isolation which in turn projects the universality of the panda's condition. This isolation exploits the possibilities of the panda as an open sign, a floating signifier that has no fixed signified, and performs a kind of decontextualization.¹¹ However, at the same time, Lo Ch'ing's pandas constantly escape attempts to transform them into *nothing but* signs: they live an embodied life and their repetitious activity can only be partially grasped by semiotics.

Indeed, these small scenes, imagining the day-to-day existence of the animal, have the effect of "usher[ing in] new intimations...out of the tedious and mundane world" (as Lo Ch'ing puts it).¹² It is precisely the apparent mundaneness of the panda's existence that prompts the viewer to consider comparisons with human existence in the contemporary moment, to consider the way human lives are bound up with nonhuman lives, even if our signifiers can seemingly float free from 'nature.' If the animal often appears to reflect the human in Lo Ch'ing's paintings, there is also the sense in which the human (as a sovereign, meaning-bestowing subject) gradually disappears from the purview of the artwork.

In Chinese painting, the artist is often considered to perfect the depiction of a particular subject (such as bamboo) when the artist ceases to look at it and actually *becomes* the subject he or she paints.¹³ A parallel process occurs in Lo Ch'ing's images of the animal: as the viewer considers the animal, he or she becomes more and more closely connected to it, until eventually there is only the animal. This move from consideration to complete absorption is evident in a work like *Nostalgia*, where an emotive state of temporal and spatial disjuncture is seemingly attributed to a panda sitting in the crook of a tree branch. The work is an invitation not to the kind of kitsch nostalgia of late capitalist consumption, but rather to a nostalgia that—intertwining the natural and the cultural—envisions a nonhuman yearning for the past expressed in both mental and embodied contemplation. We, as viewers, can imagine a whole set of things for which the panda might be nostalgic: a home, a family, a time before its own 'dissociation of sensibility.' In any case, however, this nostalgia gestures at worlds beyond human desires and sign-systems, at a deeply vital nostalgia present in the communion of the animal with the tree in which it sits: 'nature' separated from itself yet searching for itself.

In an interview conducted as part of the research for this exhibition, Lo Ch'ing discusses his depiction of the panda in relation to the history of animal painting in Chinese art. He explains that,

*Panda is not only a symbol for peace, there's also a kind of Confucian spirit there. Of course, the panda is also a symbol for environmental conservation, which moves away from this idea of prosperity and good wishes ... and [towards a] more contemporary positive way of thinking and saving the environment. And so I use the panda, dramatize it, asking the panda to impersonate some human characters, like the Buddhist monk or Confucian scholar, or ecologist or biologist.... And so the panda, in my painting, performs all kinds of activities, to symbolize or present a new world and new intellectual activities in the 20th or 21st centuries.*¹⁴

The panda in Lo Ch'ing's painting forces us to think the nonhuman, and our relationship to it—to take responsibility for thinking in new ways to meet the conditions of the Anthropocene.

III. Internal Change: Contemporaneity and Nonhuman Time

Thinking and picturing the Anthropocene inevitably involves a great effort to think and reconcile different temporalities: inner and outer, human and nonhuman, urban and rural, localized and global. Indeed, the Anthropocene must be thought in conjunction with the question of the contemporary, in which diverse global times coexist and are structured by enterprises like art, which assemble and disperse meaning and meaning-structures.¹⁵ Lo Ch'ing's art operates in the peculiar nexus created between the Anthropocene and notions of tradition, postmodernity, and contemporaneity, all of which bring their own models of historical and artistic time.

On the one hand, Lo's art is steeped in the continuity of tradition, but it also draws our attention to the Western etymology of the term 'tradition,' which shares its roots with 'betrayal.' Even as Lo's poetry and paintings develop out of long histories of linguistic and artistic practice, they also simultaneously give these traditions over to a new world. They undermine tradition as much as they reinforce it, and at the same time they undermine prevailing beliefs about our modern world as much as they embrace the novelty of our 20th and 21st-century existence. Alongside Lo's dialectical play on and with tradition stands his postmodern tendencies, which have already been discussed. Finally, the question of Lo's contemporaneity demands that we try to understand his work in terms of the clash and the mutual dependency of a number of different models of time and duration. This question is raised in the artist's animal paintings, but even more directly in his works dealing with fruits, flowers, and the contrast between the city and the forests.

Part of the significance of Lo Ch'ing's engagement with the nonhuman (and specifically with animals and plants) involves an interest in a world beyond mere semiotic play—a world in which the interplay of technology and nature has consequences that exceed the interplay of signs. However, it is also the case that writing and the sign are an important part of *both* Lo Ch'ing's appropriation of the Chinese tradition in poetry and painting *and* his engagement with Western post-structuralist theory.¹⁶ Lo Ch'ing's interest in writing and its postmodern possibilities, as a practice that is deeply significant to both Eastern and Western philosophies and artistic traditions, is always already an interest in the nonhuman and its relationship to the human.

The time of the nonhuman is obviously not homogenous; there is no question of recovering from our surroundings the dialectical Other of our own durational experience or rationalist chronology, and then performing a synthetic operation that would show that we all 'share' the same time. Rather, opening ourselves to the times of other beings involves letting go the search for a stable typology of temporality. It also involves freeing ourselves from certain persistent associations between the passage of time and apparent phenomena. Let us briefly consider Lo Ch'ing's own analysis of time as expressed in Song Dynasty painting, as a bridge that will bring us closer to the manifestations of time in the artist's own works. Lo Ch'ing recounts Shen Kuan's (1030-1094) anecdote called "On Peonies," which I quote at length:

*Minister O-yang brought an old painting called 'Peonies' in which a cat was painted under the flowers. He wanted to have a specialist evaluate it. Prime Minister Wu Cheng-ssu, a relative through marriage of O-yang, viewed it and commented: 'These are noontime peonies. How can I be sure? The petals of the flowers droop and their color is dry; these are indeed the signs of noontime flowers. Furthermore, the dark round pupils of the cat turn into lines which prove that they are the pupils of a cat at noontime.'*¹⁷

Lo Ch'ing explains that this passage reveals that the aim of the Chinese painter is to show "the internal rather than the external relationship between time and the object. ... [T]ime is not only an activator of the changes of light and shade upon the object, but most of all it is a dominant factor of internal change."¹⁸ Lo Ch'ing attributes this temporal framework, in part, to the structure of the Chinese language itself,¹⁹ but we can also see the ramifications of this alternative view of time in relation to nonhuman entanglement. Rather than picturing time straightforwardly in terms of human perceptive apparatuses (as 'changes of light and shade'), the tradition of Chinese painting can urge us to consider less qualitatively visible aspects of change: growth, decay, the obscure becoming of the nonhuman according to cycles and interruptions that extend beyond the realm of our knowledge and teleologies.

As philosopher Michael Marder has pointed out, the life cycle of the plant—" [g]ermination and growth, flourishing, dehiscence, blossoming, coming to fruition, and finally fermentation and decay"—has often been taken (by Western philosophers) as emblematic of temporalization writ large on nature.²⁰ The seeming universality of vegetal cycles, however, is always squared against the apparently complete passivity of the plant, which is at once representative of the passage of time and at the mercy of external temporal changes (the seasons, daylight, etc.). Thus, Marder argues, the time of the plant is a *hetero*-temporality, developing out of the deconstructive *difference* between the plant body's growth and the dissemination of the seed. It is also fundamentally "the time of the other," since all growth comes about from the influence of external factors (sun, water, minerals, and so forth).²¹ In fact, the plant's temporal disparity does not reinforce the simple dichotomy of inside/outside; instead, it invites us to consider a heterogeneous time (of growth, of action, of decay) that is *not* simplistically divided into an inner (subject) and an outer (object). The inner itself becomes heterogeneous, and is (dis)/continuous with the outer.

Works like *The Coming and Going of the Cities* (2009) and *Once the World's Highest Tower* (2009) juxtapose the time of flora to the time of human artifice, to the bustling speed and development of the city, modernity's icon. The flux of the city, here, is imagined as a cyclical movement more akin to that of the seasons. This cycle is juxtaposed with the deep time of trees, which both endure beyond and are exceeded by the growth of the city. In these works, the skyline of the city along the lower edge of the paintings serves as the background, and the tree becomes the lone protagonist of the composition—its gnarled trunk and abundant foliage fill the field of view. The tree itself, however, introduces its own multiple temporalities, as Marder's analysis above makes clear. The tree, a function of both its rootedness in the nourishing surface of the earth and its constant upward and outward growth towards the sun, presents us with a model of an entity fixed *between two times*. Furthermore, the tree models both interior and exterior time. Its leaves change color and fall away, its bark becomes more wrinkled and rough, and its branches twist and reach. All of these signs, however, also refer to internal transformations, ones that cannot be imaged by the Western (Renaissance) model of depicting the play of (sun)light and shadow over surface.²²

The time of flora draws our attention not only to the invisible aspects of growth—which coexist with the speed of postmodern life and the cycles of phenomena like the seasons—but also to blossoming and fruition. Lo Ch'ing addresses these ideas, which suggest the coming-to-fullness of time in the world, in works like *Things Will Be Ripe Like Persimmons When Time Comes* (2006). The ripening of the fruit as a metaphor for human development has a long history, and here Lo Ch'ing seems to extend this metaphor to all things: time becomes a uniting, homogeneous state expressed visually in the bright red skin of the persimmons. (Here again exterior appearances point to the underlying effects and processes of time.) Simultaneously, time itself is envisioned as anticipatory:

things wait for the arrival of ripeness, of fullness, of completion. This anticipatory structure emphasizes the fundamental open-endedness of the contemporary moment: the future is still undecided, and our actions in the present may reconcile our time with that of the nonhuman world, or we may continue to multiply the disjunctures between human and nonhuman times.

IV. Schizophrenia and Landscape: From Past to Future

Lo Ch'ing explains that, in the (post)modern world we live in,

*Within 12 hours, you can experience this atmosphere like that of the Song Dynasty or Tang Dynasty and within the next 12 hours you are in the modern world, in a very small room...but you can open the window, and then again you see a very classical landscape with the drama of the peaks and mist outside. I think if I can record that faithfully, my landscape is not only the portrait of myself, but also the portrait of my time.*²³

This spatial and temporal rupture is, he says, a schizophrenic one—and yet this schizophrenia can be navigated by those who cultivate an understanding both of the past and its tradition and of the vagaries of the present. Lo describes his art in relation to the experience of travelling through time, experiencing landscapes as painters first experienced them during the Song or Tang Dynasties. If Lo's art can transport us into the past, it also forces us to think about the future, to take responsibility for the global conditions of the Anthropocene and imagine changes and solutions to its problems.

The works included in this portion of the exhibition raise questions about how we can think, live, and act in the schizophrenic Anthropocene—but just as importantly, they remind us of the animals and plants with whom we share the world. Pandas, palm trees, persimmons: they all grow and produce their own structures of meaning in dialogue with our own, and our fate is fundamentally tied to theirs. Before we can think the future, we must fully imagine the present, and to occupy the present we must understand our past: Lo Ch'ing's poem-paintings, merging philosophies and aesthetics from across the globe and dissolving dualities of East and West, help us do just this.

¹ This essay accompanies one of the galleries in the online exhibition *Lo Ch'ing: The Poetry of Postmodern Landscape*, co-curated by Lindsay DuPertuis, Suzie Kim, and Raino Isto, in association with the Department of Art History and Archaeology, University of Maryland, College Park, and the Michelle Smith Collaboratory for Visual Culture. See <http://the-poets-brush.artinterp.org/omeka>.

² "The Postmodern (?) Misquote in the Poetry and Painting of Lo Ch'ing," *World Literature Today* 65:3 (Summer 1991): 421-426.

³ For a succinct overview of the Anthropocene and its effects on visibility, see Emmelhainz, Irmgard, "Conditions of Visuality Under the Anthropocene and Images of the Anthropocene to Come," *e-flux* 63 (March 2015), <http://www.e-flux.com/journal/conditions-of-visibility-under-the-anthropocene-and-images-of-the-anthropocene-to-come/> (accessed March 20, 2015). In his synthesis of elements of the Chinese painting tradition—as well as tropes of Western critical discourse—Lo Ch'ing's work obviously also engages with the possibilities of vision in the contemporary global moment.

⁴ Lo Ch'ing, "Panda, A Pensive Confucian Gentleman of Our Times," 6.

⁵ Ibid., 7.

⁶ Thusly does Paul Manfredi summarize Lo Ch'ing's own assessment of the contemporary artistic moment in which he lives and works. See Manfredi, *Modern Poetry in China: A Visual-Verbal Dynamic* (New York: Cambria, 2014), 72.

⁷ As Robert W. Duffy notes, Lo Ch'ing "is concerned about the natural world and the effects of technology on it." (See "Lo Ch'ing Distills the Essence of Our Time," *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, May 2, 1993.) That is, his art understands the mediating role of technology in any representation of 'nature'—it does not presume to go back before technology, but to consider technology's ontology intertwined with nature.

⁸ Though, importantly, language (and art) do not give us direct access to any unchanging essence or nature in this extra-linguistic world. At best, they can show us the depths of what we cannot concretely know about things. This does not mean, however, that we are not connected to these things. Far from it: the condition I am describing is premised upon our unavoidable entanglement in things, but in such a way that *knowledge of their truth* is never applicable.

⁹ Ian Bogost, *Alien Phenomenology, Or What It's Like to Be a Thing* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012), 6.

¹⁰ Jane Bennett, *Vibrant Matter: A Political Ecology of Things* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2010), 120-122.

¹¹ Lo Ch'ing discusses the tension between the inherited tradition of graphic signifiers and the possibilities for the contemporary artist to work with "unbound" signifiers in his unpublished essay, "Signifier Bound and Unbound: The Relationship between Text and Image in Contemporary Chinese Literature and Painting," March 1993, written during his time as a Fulbright scholar-in-residence at Washington University in St. Louis. I would like to argue that while this tension relates directly to his appropriation and integration of different aspects of the Chinese tradition, it also functions analogously in the context of his work's navigation of nonhuman signifiers.

¹² Lo Ch'ing, "See a Cosmos in a Vignette" (Taipei: 99 Degrees Art Center, 2010), 5.

¹³ For a succinct summary of this idea of Chinese art's communion with the natural world, and its transcendence of the Western subject-object dichotomy, see Simon Leys, *The Hall of Uselessness: Collected Essays* (New York: The New York Review of Books, 2013), 338-343.

¹⁴ See the interview conducted with Lo Ch'ing in association with this exhibition.

¹⁵ For two discussions of the possible definitions of contemporary art, considered from a critical perspective, see Peter Osborne, *Anywhere or Not At All: Philosophy of Contemporary Art* (New York: Verso, 2013), and Terry Smith, *What is Contemporary Art?* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2009).

¹⁶ It should be noted that Lo Ch'ing's engagement with post-structuralist thought is sustained: he has both lectured on the work of authors like Foucault and Derrida and translated the writing of Lyotard. See Olivia Sand, "Profile: Lo Ch'ing," *Asian Art Newspaper*, October 2014, 6.

¹⁷ Qtd. in Lo Ch'ing, "The Chinese Language and Chinese Landscape Painting," *Studies in English Literature and Linguistics* (May 1987): 96.

¹⁸ Lo Ch'ing, "The Chinese Language and Chinese Landscape Painting," 96.

¹⁹ Ibid., 95.

²⁰ Michael Marder, *Plant-Thinking: A Philosophy of Vegetal Life* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2013), 94.

²¹ Ibid., 101.

²² See the interview conducted with Lo Ch'ing in association with this exhibition.

²³ See the interview conducted with Lo Ch'ing in association with this exhibition.