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Sidney D. Gamble: His Life and Work
西德尼·甘博的生平与工作

西德尼·甘博1917年到1932年间三次来到中国拍摄了大量的照片，为中国这一重要历史时期留下了珍贵的影像档案。甘博是北京基督教青年会的干事，负责社会调查和教育改革方面的工作。甘博是位优秀的业余摄影师和社会学家，他的镜头记录了中国的社会、老百姓的方方面面，这样珍贵的画面如今存世已不多。

Sidney Gamble’s photography of China, shot over three trips between 1917 and 1932, represents an extraordinary contribution to the visual archive for an important period in Chinese history from which few images survive today. As an amateur photographer and trained sociologist, Gamble worked as secretary for the Beijing YMCA, helping to coordinate educational and social reform projects. Through the access these activities granted him to wide-ranging elements of Chinese society, Gamble built a deep relationship with China and its people, a closeness reflected in the intimacy of his photographs.

Sidney Gamble & Mass Education Movement Secretary
西德尼·甘博和
平民教育运动的干事定县, 1931年

Sidney D. Gamble
西德尼·甘博
山海关 Shanhaiqian, 1918年

Sidney Gamble, Elizabeth Gamble and Esther Moody
甘博夫妇和埃丝特·穆迪
潭柘寺, 1924年
Gamble in Chair
坐轿子的甘博
山东 Shandong. 1919年

YMCA Building
基督教青年会总部
北京 Beijing. 1918年
1890 - Born on July 12 in Cincinnati, Ohio, grandson of James Gamble, one of the co-founders of Proctor & Gamble.

1899 - Travels to China with parents to Hangzhou.

1908 - First sojourn in China. Traveled with parents to Hangzhou.

1912 - Graduated from Princeton University with a bachelor's degree in literature.

1914-1916 - Master of Arts degree in economics at the University of California at Berkeley.

1916-1917 - Taught in economics department, University of California at Berkeley.


1919 - Travels to China’s interior.

1920 - Travels to Shanghaid.

1921 - Published first book, Peking: A Social Survey.

1922 - Visited Dingxiang where the National Association for the Service Education Movement, led by Dr. James Yen, was based.

1927 - Returns to the United States.

1929 - Elected President of Princeton-Yenching Foundation.
1918
Visited flood relief camps in Tianjin and traveled to Beijing, Xiamen, Fuzhou, Ningbo, Hong Kong. Joined the YMCA in Beijing and became a member of Princeton University Center in China (Princeton Court).

1918
Visited Beidahe and Bei Niu Ding (Hebei).

1918
Conducted a social survey of Beijing while teaching economics at Yenching University.

1919
Visited Baoding and Kaifeng during Spring Festival, and Taishan, Jining, and Qufu in March.

1924
To Chengde, and Tianjin.

1925
Traveled to Shanghai in January and returned to Beijing by way of Qinhuangdao and Tianjin. Second trip to Miao Feng Shan in April.

1925
Taught at Yenching University.

1925
Traveled to Japan to join Dr. and Mrs. Lowe, and accompanied them to Beijing.

1926

1931
Returned to China for fourth and last sojourn. Became involved in the administration of Yenching University.

1932
Departed Shanghai for the United States on February 23.

1933-1968
Published books and articles on aspects of Chinese village and family life. Elected member of the National Council of the YMCA; President of Princeton-in-Asia.

1968
Died in New York on March 29 at the age of 78.
Sidney D. Gamble’s photographs at Duke University Libraries

About fifteen years after Sidney Gamble’s death, his daughter, Catherine Curran, found a trove of nitrate negatives in a closet in the family’s home in New York. Stored in beautiful rosewood boxes, the negatives were housed in individual paper sleeves, annotated with typed and handwritten captions. In order to better preserve them, Ms. Curran hired an archivist, who transferred the negatives into archival sleeves and transcribed the captions onto typed labels. In addition, Ms. Curran made contact sheets of all the negatives in the order in which they were found. She used these contact prints to create ten photograph albums to serve as a reference for the negative collection. In 1986, Catherine Curran established the Sidney D. Gamble Foundation for China Studies to provide for preservation and access to the photographs. A review of the first exhibit catalog prompted the Duke University Libraries’ visual materials archivist to invite Ms. Curran to place Sidney Gamble’s photographs in the Libraries’ Archive of Documentary Arts. An agreement to bring the Gamble collection to Duke was signed in March 2006.

Duke University Libraries contracted with Chicago Albumen Works in Massachusetts to digitize the highly flammable nitrate negatives. Digitization of the Gamble collection began in October 2006 and continued through the spring of 2007. In addition to the photographs, the vendor also digitized the typed image labels to transform the labels into raw texts. This text became the foundation for the image captions and geographic headings in the Sidney D. Gamble Photographs digital collection. In early 2008, Duke University Libraries’ Digital Collections staff updated the geographic names in the labels to Library of Congress Subject Headings formats, added province names to the metadata, and standardized the descriptions to support searching and browsing. The complete collection was published in fall 2008 and is available online at http://library.duke.edu/digitalcollections/gamble/.
Thanksgiving Day Review, Hall of Supreme Harmony & Soldiers, Celebration of WWI victory.
感恩节，庆祝一战胜利太和殿大阅兵上的军队
(1918年11月28日)

Thanksgiving Day Review, President Making Speech Telar
感恩节大阅兵，大总统徐世昌讲演感恩
(1918年11月28日)
Devil Dance at Lama Temple, March 1, 1919, Dancer in Mask
雍和宮，1919年3月1日，打鬼舞，戴面具的舞者
Changing China
变化中的中国

甘博在华期间，正是中国社会经历巨变的时期。他的镜头记录了各种老式的和新式的社会机构，如：新式的学校、西式医院、新旧监狱以及各种各样的传统的和新的交通方式，展现了一幅变化中的社会图景。

Gamble visited China in the midst of its transition to a modern society. By contrasting old and new forms, his photographs represent the way people of the time adapted to the emergence of modern institutions, such as hospitals, prisons, and schools. These transitions were also marked by new modes of transportation and infrastructure that changed the Chinese landscape and way of life.
Funeral, Ford, and Man
随葬的纸扎福特车和人

Peking Women's Hospital, Charity Ward
北京妇婴医院，慈善病房
Prison, Prisoner at Gate
老式监狱 站在门边的囚犯

Poor Boys Prison, Making Baskets
不良少年教养院 做篮子
Life Through the Lens
甘博镜头下的北京生活

作为受过专业训练的社会学家，甘博的镜头不是简单冰冷的记录，他捕捉到了人们生活的各种鲜活画面，透漏出了他的人道关怀。镜头下的男男女女所展示的丰富画面显示出社会变化正渗透到日常的方方面面。

Through his education in the social sciences, Gamble brings to his photography an informed perspective that extends beyond the simple documentation of the passage to modernity. His intimate photographs of people in the midst of a transitioning society demonstrate a sensitivity to individual humanity and the phenomena of everyday life. This broad array of portraits of men and women engaged in the various activities of public life provide us with a glimpse of social change not as a mere institutional process, but as the lived experience of a diversity of people.
Boy Miner Dragging Coal from Mine
煤矿上的童工拖煤出矿井

Pulling Fish Nets
拉渔网
Gathering Pods - Moat
筒子河（护城河）里采莲子

Man Smoking Pipe, Pushing Baby Carriage
男人一手抽烟斗一手推婴儿车
Head in Cage
示众的人头

Reading
读报
PHOTO ESSAYS
Penetrating the Past: Reexamining Agency and Intentionality in Sidney Gamble’s Street Photography

By Jason T onio Woerner
(Email: Jason T onio Woerner is a documentary photographer and PhD student in Cultural Anthropology at Duke University)

A late middle-aged woman sits behind a basket of eggs on a crowded Beijing street. Although the sun is shining directly on her, she remains bundled in winter clothes, a cloth wrapped around her head. Another woman, younger, better dressed and out of focus, crouches in front of the woman’s basket, examining the eggs inside, her back to the camera. A young boy and a middle-aged man, of indeterminate relationship to the vendor and her customer, are gathered around watching this transaction take place. In this photograph, titled simply, “Buying Eggs,” Sidney Gamble has produced and preserved a wealth of ethnographic information about early twentieth-century China invaluable to scholars today (see fig. 1). Images from this period in Chinese history are scarce, and Gamble’s photography gives a rare glimpse into ways of life in a time of great change. Class, commerce, gender, the transition to modernity – visual representations of these issues and many others are attested to in “Buying Eggs” and the rest of Gamble’s collection. By straddling the line between documentary photographer and sociologist, Sidney Gamble’s work makes an especially important contribution to an otherwise gaping lacuna in the photographic record.

This laudatory description of Gamble and his work is accurate, yet far from complete. His work is rare, both for its photographic professionalism and for its being sociologically informed. It does provide an abundance of visual information about a time period in China for which the visual record is conspicuously empty. In the near century which has passed since his work in the 1910s to the 1930s, however, the standard narratives surrounding both photography and social science and the assumptions which underlie them have undergone dramatic change. Early efforts of the surrealists notwithstanding, photography at the time was generally accorded the status of objective recorder of truth, while anthropology, burgeoning in the first half of the twentieth century, produced totalizing accounts of its ethnographic subjects that assumed a privileged position for the ethnographer as an embedded-yet-removed observer of reality. In the 1960s and 70s, the reflexive turn in the humanities caused a rethinking of both fields. Accounts of photography that placed objective value unquestioningly in the hands of the documentarian were dismantled, just as anthropologists and social scientists began to contend with the effect of the Western (colonial) presence and examine the knowledge they produced as a constructed object independent and separate from that which formed is subject. Despite these significant shifts in the academy, the standard narratives that surround Gamble and his work have gone strikingly unchanged.

In images like, “Buying Eggs,” the viewer is offered access to information about forms of commerce, the organization of labor and family life and reflections of class and gender in early twentieth-century China. Such a reading of Gamble’s photography, ethnographically illuminating though it is, falls short of addressing the potential understandings accessible in these photographs. These details which make up the raw material of ethnography—ways of dress, modes of economic exchange, etc. —fall into a category Roland Barthes would have called studium, elements of an image consciously noted and deliberately included by the photographer. As those who are familiar with Barthes already know, however, the studium is insufficient grounds through which to understand an image. To engage solely with the ethnographic elements of an image captured by the photographer’s design is to engage purely with his or her intentionality, and thus inadvertently leave him ensconced in the seat of objective knowledge. Thus, it is necessary to look past Gamble’s intentions, past his studium, and reread his images from a perspective of chance and the encounter.

While Roland Barthes’s now classic Camera Lucida was not responding directly to the reflexive turn and debates about the nature of objectivity, his theorization of photography dislodging the photographer from a position of agency serves as a useful intervention into Gamble’s documentary work. His concepts of studium and punctum offer a framework for understanding images which decenters intentionality and artistic choice, and instead emphasizes an intimate, personal relationship between the viewer and the photograph. Rather than engaging explicitly with questions of “truth” and “reality,” Barthes bypasses the authority of the photographer entirely, decentering his aims as secondary to personal, disruptive details caught by chance through the lens and raised to importance in the eye of the viewer. The agency which Barthes ascribes to the Spectator—a photograph’s individual viewer—and the decentering of intentionality in favor of chance makes for a peculiar framework to apply to Gamble’s photography of China. Indeed, much of the theory presented in Camera Lucida seems to direct its application to intimate, personal photographs rather than the kind of ethnographic work of public spaces produced by Gamble (Barthes, in fact, seemed to have a unique disdain for any attempts at candid street photography). Yet it is precisely this incongruity that makes Gamble’s work in China so compelling to consider in light of Barthes’s framework. And it is also why Barthes’s framework, not explicitly a part of the humanities’ reflexive turn, is such a useful analytical tool to be deployed in its name.
For Gamble, the studium of his photographs is in the ethno-agency and thus see past the narrow sense of objectivity his means through which to bypass Gamble and his photographic Gamble's photography, by allowing us to deploy chance as a way that the punctum becomes a useful tool for understanding those of the subject, chance, and the Spectator. It is also in this way that Barthes's framework becomes subversive, in like a supplement that is at once inevitable and delightful. "It must not be so; it occurs in the field of the photographed thing Barthes says, "or at least is not strictly, intentional, and probably must not be so; it occurs in the field of the photographed thing like a supplement that is at once inevitable and delightful." It is in this way that Barthes's framework becomes subversive, in its redistribution of power from the hands of the Operator to those of the subject, chance, and the Spectator. It is also in this way that the punctum becomes a useful tool for understanding Gamble's photography, by allowing us to deploy chance as a means through which to bypass Gamble and his photographic agency and thus see past the narrow sense of objectivity his disciplines were accorded in their time.

As alluded to above, Barthes's concept of studium refers to the understanding of an image as the photographer wanted it to be understood. To engage with an image on the level of studium is to exist in a world of the photographer's intentionality, to dialogue with his choices and interact with an image on his terms. The studium functions through cultural codes, through a shared semiotic language between an image's producer and viewer. Thus, Barthes tells us, the genre of ethnographic photography, in spite of the exigencies of chance inherent in fieldwork, is rife with the material of studium; it is studium itself which informs ethnographic study. Thus, it would seem that studium should serve as a useful point of entry through which to examine Gamble's photography in China. His images of a modernizing Beijing and contrasting rural hinterlands abound with the kind of ethnographic details that inform the curious viewer about life and society in turn-of-the-century China. To accept the knowledge presented by these images, however, is to remain in this realm of studium, our understanding circumscribed by a photographer's intentionality a century past, and thus also to repeat a hagiographic narrative that ascribes the privilege of objective value to photographer and social scientist.

In order to question this narrative and to engage critically with Gamble, it is necessary to exit the space delineated by his intentions. For this purpose, Barthes's punctum offers a means through which to read Gamble's work that strips it of the power with which it was originally accorded. The punctum consists of details captured within a photograph that intervene upon an image's studium to arrest the Spectator's attention and arouse emotion or reflection, to "prick" him. By definition puncta are captured by chance; they are unintentional on the part of the photographer. "Hence the detail which interests me is not," Barthes says, "or at least is not strictly, intentional, and probably must not be so; it occurs in the field of the photographed thing like a supplement that is at once inevitable and delightful." It is in this way that Barthes's framework becomes subversive, in its redistribution of power from the hands of the Operator to those of the subject, chance, and the Spectator. It is also in this way that the punctum becomes a useful tool for understanding Gamble's photography, by allowing us to deploy chance as a means through which to bypass Gamble and his photographic agency and thus see past the narrow sense of objectivity his disciplines were accorded in their time.

For Gamble, the studium of his photographs is in the ethno-graphic details he set out to capture and record, for what it tells of the life of the Chinese peasant or laborer or urban dweller in the time he was working. For his Spectator, for us viewing his work nearly a century later, their punctum comes in the form of unintended details, details which often reveal more about Gamble's presence, the presence of the West, the presence of change, than they do about what Gamble himself was seeing. In one image, titled "Loading Baggage Cot Five" we see a group of men and boys loading cargo on the back of a pack mule in the mountains (possibly the supplies of Gamble himself) (see fig. 2). Through Gamble's intention, its studium, we learn about the China of his era: we see how people dress, how they traveled, what the landscape looked like outside the city. The punctum which advenes upon this ethnographic lesson, however, is the off-center, shifted, cocky stance of an adolescent boy looking back at Gamble, a mirrored gaze echoed (perhaps with even greater intensity) by a younger child, out of focus behind him. While it is the pack mule, the labor, the ethnographic information that is of interest to Gamble, it is the returned glance of these two boys revealing Gamble's presence that arrests our attention and shifts the meaning of the photograph from its subject to the encounter itself. This punctum, this chance detail outside the control and intention of the Operator, allows us to read Gamble's work in such a way that impedes upon and disrupts the position of the anthropologist, the social scientist, the photographer. Reread through the returned stare of two young laborers, the image becomes less about what Gamble is trying to show us, and more about Gamble himself.

Figure 2: Loading Baggage Cot

Applying Barthes's framework to Gamble's photography, or that of any historical ethnographic images, is illuminating; the unintentional, chance nature of the punctum only gain saliency through time. There is danger, however, in using Barthes to understand Gamble's work. First, the punctum of a photograph is deeply individual. Barthes goes to great extent to elaborate on the personal nature of punctum, posing it as an element which may not only not be shared by all Spectators, but one which is best realized entirely by the individual. In other words, the punctum is as much submitted by the Spectator, calling on a personal history, as it is an extant element of the image itself. Those familiar with Camera Lucida need not be reminded of the part in the text where this is made most clear. When Barthes turns to a discussion of the Winter Garden Photograph, the image of his deceased mother which served as the starting and ending point for Camera Lucida, and, indeed, around which
his entire theoretical framework is built, he refrains at the last moment from revealing to the reader the image in question, knowing full well that an image which appears to him as rife with punctum would read to us as mere studium.

Thus, when we examine an image like “Woman with Cigarette,” we can identify immediately the studium: we learn something of the lives of urban Chinese of the period from the way they dress, from how they smoke, and from their collective walk (see fig. 3). The returned glance of one pale-faced woman is in this case studium, not punctum – disturbing though it is, it is clearly the incongruity of this glance among the other anonymous marchers that Gamble intended us to see. Rather, in this case, its punctum is a deeply personal one: the tension between the right-reaching gesture of a whisp of white smoke from her cigarette, mirrored above by left-reaching branches silhouetted black against the sky. Such a punctum cannot be expected to disrupt for others as it disrupts for me.

Figure 3: Woman and Cigarette

This pitfall notwithstanding, studium and punctum can be a particularly useful framework for decentering objectivity and the photographer’s agency by shifting attention away from Gamble’s intended subject to chance details which reframe our understanding of the photographic event to include not only the Actor, but the photographic encounter itself, particularly in cases of candid street photography. Furthermore, in some cases these chance details override the agency of both the Operator and the Spectator, offering new ways to understand Barthes’s theorization of studium and punctum.

Candid photography depends on the photographic subject being unaware of the act of his or her capture. Barthes describes this situation as one in which the act of collusion normally present between subject and photographer, an intentionality made manifest in the act of the pose, is appropriated entirely into the hands of the Operator. The photographer deploys this intentionality, referred to by Barthes as a “performance,” through the “shock,” the surprise of the moment in which a subject is photographed without his knowledge. Put another way, Barthes believes that the fundamental essence of photography is to reveal something hidden about the subject of the photograph. This essence is at its most fundamental in candid photography, when the subject’s lack of awareness of the camera’s presence allows the photographer to capture and reveal something of the subject so well hidden that he/she may not have even been aware of it. Yet this same moment (the “shock”) also represents the total ascendancy of the photographer over the subject, the subject being completely unable to mediate his image or have any control over what is revealed about him via colluding with the photographer through the self-conscious pose. Thus, despite embodying the fundamental element of the medium, candid photography is also the mode in which the balance of power between the photographer and the subject is at its widest disparity. Bearing in mind that absence of intentionality on the part of the photographer is a necessary precondition in the formulation of the punctum, this seizure of control by the photographer, through the act of “shock,” represents for Barthes the greatest kind of departure from a mode of photography conducive to the intimate encounter around which his theory is built. In other words, what is anathema to Barthes about candid photography is that it represents the epitome of the photographer’s dominance over the agency of the subject himself; this dominance renders impossible a genuinely intimate connection between the viewer and the subject. In candid photography, the photographer’s intentionality steps in (through the act of the “shock”) to fill the gap normally occupied by the Actor whose knowledge of the camera possesses him with an intentionality of his own (embodied in the pose). Other critics have read this distaste for the intentional, especially with regards to the photographer, as a form of antitheatricality, against which the punctum serves as an ontological guarantee.

It is at this juncture that Gamble’s work offers new insight with which to consider Barthes’s studium and punctum. While not all the images Gamble produced of China from 1908 to 1932 qualify as candid (many, in fact, were set up just for his benefit), a great deal of them are devoted to photographing daily life in public spaces, what we now call “street photography.” Of these, some are candid, many are not, and the majority represent a liminal space between the candid and the posed. In this liminal space, in photographs taken of crowded streets and busy squares whose inhabitants represent varying levels of awareness of the photographer’s presence, Gamble’s images are able to respond to Barthes’s critique of candid photography. Within this body of semi-candid work, where Gamble’s labors are their most classically ethnographic, we can find instances of chance intervening upon the image to subvert the photographer’s attempted “shock,” his intentionality, his “performance,” appropriated from an unsuspecting Actor. Through these encounters between lens and unintended subject, the element of chance bypasses both the photographer and the subject, undermining and sidestepping their theatricality to intercede directly upon the Spectator himself.

One example of an image inhabiting the liminal space between candid and posed is a photograph titled simply “Experiment,” in which Gamble shows us three men attempting to sieve something over a pan while a crowd of people looks on (see fig 4). It is unclear from their reactions whether the men in the center who make up the ostensible subject are aware of the photographer’s presence or not. What is clear, however, is that a few members of the crowd have, in fact, seen Gamble and are returning the gaze back towards the lens, most notably a boy standing directly behind the “experiment” itself. Through this series of returned gazes, individuals making up the background of the image subvert what Barthes would have read as Gamble’s seizure of the intended subject’s agency; the “shock” through
which Gamble attempts to capture something essential about the men that make up the image's subject is itself reappropriated by an accidental subject whose collective stare reaches past the photographer directly to the viewer himself, forming an antitheatrical punctum that regrounds the image outside the realm of the photographer's intentions. The subversive gaze of the background subject which undermines the agentive hegemony of the Operator, further serves in the context of Gamble and his work as a photographer and social scientist, as a form of resistance to present power dynamics within the space of the photographic event.

On a few rare occasions, Gamble doffs the ethnographic photographer's mantle and acknowledges both his own presence and its effect on the people who make up his subject. Even in these scarce cases when he shifts his gaze from the fictitious, candid subject to the photographic encounter, however, the agency of his subjects evades his control and disrupts his intent, reframing the image on new grounds. In the curiously titled, "Natives Watching Photography," Gamble seemingly attempts to capture a group of people from Sichuan who had been gazing with interest at the photographer and his equipment (see fig. 6). At the moment the shot was taken, however, all of the "watching natives" averted their gazes to look in the direction of anything but "photography." Similarly, in "Boy and Film Can," a young child grasps a token souvenir from Gamble, clutching the waist of an adult, whose arm rests reassuringly on his shoulder (see fig. 7). Gamble has lowered his perspective to the boy's level, attempting a close-up shot of the child with his gift. Rather than examine the film canister or look towards the camera, however, the boy stares blankly, eyes unfocused, refusing the contrived interaction Gamble set out to capture. Thus we see not only, the boy in the pose the photographer attempting candid photography is subverted by a chance, mirror gaze or an unintended shadow, but also how explicit engagement with the encounter by the photographer is itself disrupted by the subject's own agency. By refusing complicity with the photographer, the awkward posture and limp stares of the subjects locate these images in a space outside both the candid and the posed; the uncontrolled nature of punctum, manifest in an uncooperative subject thrusts these photographs, again, into a liminal space, only this time from a realm of the posed towards the candid, rather than the other way around.

“Buying Eggs,” the image through which we first engaged with Gamble at the start of this essay, also exists in an uncertain, semi-candid space, though in this case its subversive punctum takes another form than the returned gaze of an unintended subject. As discussed in the earlier treatment, the image's studium, Gamble's intended subject, makes itself clear. We see three people squatting over baskets of eggs on a public street, while others stand or lean around going about their business. Through its details we gain ethnographic knowledge about the nature of commerce and public space. Its punctum, however, is Gamble's shadow, caused by the chance position of the sun in relation to the photographer and subject, reaching subtly into the bottom half of the frame. Through the gesture of this shadow, the viewer is reminded of the photographer's presence, and the taken-for-granted candid nature of the image is called into question. The expressions on the faces of the merchants take on a different meaning as they are no longer solely engaged in the act of commerce, but may be actively ignoring the obtrusive presence of Gamble and his camera. Thus the image is thrust uncomfortably into the liminal space between the candid and the posed, and Gamble's presumed “shock” is undermined by the possibility of pose and performance on behalf of his no-longer unsuspecting subject. In other words, once pricked by the chance punctum of Gamble's shadow, we reframe our relationship to the subject of the image to bypass the photographer's intentions, connecting around him directly to the subjects themselves.

Another image, taken in So Village, depicts the front of a home built of stone and wood (see fig. 5). A pair of dogs on a dirt path and some chickens foreground the structure. The image's title, "House Entrance," directs us towards Gamble's ethnographic intent: a record of rural, domestic architecture. Closer examination, however, reveals a man, presumably the home's inhabitant, looking directly at the photographer, perched discreetly in front of a wooden wall, so merged with his surroundings as to appear secondary to the livestock and the structure itself. The direct gaze of this subtle figure not only reframes the image in terms of the ethnographic encounter, as with “Experiment” and “Loading Baggage Cot Five,” but also undermines Gamble's attempt at genre, recasting the photograph from architectural

ethnography to one in which the overlooked subject assumes the central role. The ethnographic knowledge that comprises the studium of Gamble's intent is reclaimed by the punctum of the photograph's unintended subject.

Through its details we gain ethnographic knowledge about the nature of commerce and public space. Its punctum, however, is Gamble's shadow, caused by the chance position of the sun in relation to the photographer and subject, reaching subtly into the bottom half of the frame. Through the gesture of this shadow, the viewer is reminded of the photographer's presence, and the taken-for-granted candid nature of the image is called into question. The expressions on the faces of the merchants take on a different meaning as they are no longer solely engaged in the act of commerce, but may be actively ignoring the obtrusive presence of Gamble and his camera. Thus the image is thrust uncomfortably into the liminal space between the candid and the posed, and Gamble's presumed “shock” is undermined by the possibility of pose and performance on behalf of his no-longer unsuspecting subject. In other words, once pricked by the chance punctum of Gamble's shadow, we reframe our relationship to the subject of the image to bypass the photographer's intentions, connecting around him directly to the subjects themselves.

On a few rare occasions, Gamble doffs the ethnographic photographer's mantle and acknowledges both his own presence and its effect on the people who make up his subject. Even in these scarce cases when he shifts his gaze from the fictitious, candid subject to the photographic encounter, however, the agency of his subjects evades his control and disrupts his intent, reframing the image on new grounds. In the curiously titled, "Natives Watching Photography," Gamble seemingly attempts to capture a group of people from Sichuan who had been gazing with interest at the photographer and his equipment (see fig. 6). At the moment the shot was taken, however, all of the “watching natives” averted their gazes to look in the direction of anything but “photography.” Similarly, in “Boy and Film Can,” a young child grasps a token souvenir from Gamble, clutching the waist of an adult, whose arm rests reassuringly on his shoulder (see fig. 7). Gamble has lowered his perspective to the boy's level, attempting a close-up shot of the child with his gift. Rather than examine the film canister or look towards the camera, however, the boy stares blankly, eyes unfocused, refusing the contrived interaction Gamble set out to capture. Thus we see not only, the boy in the pose the photographer attempting candid photography is subverted by a chance, mirror gaze or an unintended shadow, but also how explicit engagement with the encounter by the photographer is itself disrupted by the subject's own agency. By refusing complicity with the photographer, the awkward posture and limp stares of the subjects locate these images in a space outside both the candid and the posed; the uncontrolled nature of punctum, manifest in an uncooperative subject thrusts these photographs, again, into a liminal space, only this time from a realm of the posed towards the candid, rather than the other way around.
The subject’s behavior may, indeed, be a kind of performance, responding to the presence of the camera, but as it rejects both collusion of the pose and the “shock” of the candid, it is a subversive performance of ultimate antitheatricality, an act of resistance against the agency, power and presumed objectivity of the Operator.

Gamble's images have the potential to engage with our very understanding of agency and the encounter itself. The chance locking of gaze with an unintended figure over subject, photographer, and century of time, an uncontrolled shadow, the refusal to cooperate in pose—these acts of chance and subjective recalcitrance not only unsettle notions of subjective, photographic agency, but also serve as minor acts of resistance to the power and authority of the lens and the West.

Figure 6: Natives Watching Photography

Figure 7: Boy and Film Can

It is in this way that Gamble's photography of early twentieth-century China has the greatest capacity to inform our current understanding of the period, through reading the agency of his ethnographic subject in the blurred boundaries between the candid and the posed. His images yield an abundance of ethnographic knowledge for a period in which the photographic record is thin. Reread through a more contemporary lens of the reflexive turn, they also are able to disrupt the position of the photographer and ethnographer and shift our attention from their subject to the ethnographic encounter. Yet more than that, through the unexpected and uncooperative nature of chance,
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北京一条拥挤的大街上，一位中年妇女坐在一篮鸡蛋后面。虽然太阳正直直地照射在她身上，但她还是裹着厚厚的冬衣，头上围着一布条。在焦点以外，还有一位较年轻的、衣着较好的女子蹲伏在中年妇女的篮子前，背对镜头挑拣着篮里的鸡蛋。一位年轻的男孩和一位中年男子正在围观这比买卖的进行，不确定他们与摊主或顾客是何关系。在这幅简单地题为《买鸡蛋》的照片中，西德尼·甘博展现并保存了有关二十世纪初的中国丰富的民志信息，对今日的学者有着无可估量的价值。中国历史上的这一时期影像资料稀缺，而甘博的摄影作品向人们提供了窥见这一巨变时代之生活方式的难得一瞥。阶级、贸易、性别、现代性——这些及许多其他议题在《买鸡蛋》及甘博的其余作品中得到了视觉再现。作为横跨两个领域的纪实摄影师兼社会学家，西德尼·甘博用其作品为填补摄影史上的巨大空白作出了重要贡献。

图1: 买鸡蛋

以上这段对甘博及其作品赞誉的描述是准确的，但远非完整。他所拍摄的这些照片展现出罕见的摄影专业主义与社会学知识。它也确实为中国历史上一段严重缺乏视觉记录的时期提供了匮乏这一巨变时代之生活方式的难得一瞥。阶级、贸易、性别、现代性——这些及许多其他议题在《买鸡蛋》及甘博的其余作品中得到了视觉再现。作为横跨两个领域的纪实摄影师兼社会学家，西德尼·甘博用其作品为填补摄影史上的巨大空白作出了重要贡献。

在北京一条拥挤的大街上，一位中年妇女坐在一篮鸡蛋后面。虽然太阳正直直地照射在她身上，但她还是裹着厚厚的冬衣，头上围着一布条。在焦点以外，还有一位较年轻的、衣着较好的女子蹲伏在中年妇女的篮子前，背对镜头挑拣着篮里的鸡蛋。一位年轻的男孩和一位中年男子正在围观这比买卖的进行，不确定他们与摊主或顾客是何关系。在这幅简单地题为《买鸡蛋》的照片中，西德尼·甘博展现并保存了有关二十世纪初的中国丰富的民志信息。对今日的学者有着无可估量的价值。中国历史上的这一时期影像资料稀缺，而甘博的摄影作品向人们提供了窥见这一巨变时代之生活方式的难得一瞥。阶级、贸易、性别、现代性——这些及许多其他议题在《买鸡蛋》及甘博的其余作品中得到了视觉再现。作为横跨两个领域的纪实摄影师兼社会学家，西德尼·甘博用其作品为填补摄影史上的巨大空白作出了重要贡献。
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以上这段对甘博及其作品赞誉的描述是准确的，但远非完整。他所拍摄的这些照片展现出罕见的摄影专业主义与社会学知识。它也确实为中国历史上一段严重缺乏视觉记录的时期提供了匮乏这一巨变时代之生活方式的难得一瞥。阶级、贸易、性别、现代性——这些及许多其他议题在《买鸡蛋》及甘博的其余作品中得到了视觉再现。作为横跨两个领域的纪实摄影师兼社会学家，西德尼·甘博用其作品为填补摄影史上的巨大空白作出了重要贡献。

正如上文所提及的，巴特的“知面”概念是指，按摄影师所希望的解读方式去理解图像。在知面的层次上，图像的考量就是停留摄影师的意向性世界中，与他的选择对话，按他的要求与图像进行互动。而在知面的层次上，图像的考量就是停留摄影师的意向性世界中，与他的选择对话，按他的要求与图像进行互动。
28-30）。因此，知面可以作为考量甘博中国摄影的有用切入点。他那些关于现代化过程中的北京以及与之对比鲜明的内陆农村的作品充满了民族志细节，向好奇的观众传递有关世纪之交中国社会与日常生活的信息。然而，如果接受了这些图像所呈现的知识，就是停留在了知面的领域中，让我们的理解被一个世纪前的摄影师的意向性所限定，从而重复着将客观价值的特权归属于摄影师与社会科学家的理想化叙述。

为了质疑这一叙述并批判地探讨甘博，我们有必要退出由他的意图所勾勒出的空间。巴特的“刺点”概念为这一目的提供了一种去除甘博作品原有权力的解读方式。"刺点"由照片中所捕捉到的、搅乱图像知面的那些细节组成，它们吸引了观看者的注意并引发其情绪或反思，亦即"刺痛"了观看者（1980, 43）。根据定义，刺点是偶然捕捉到的。对于摄影师来说它是意料之外的——因此，那吸引我的细节，"巴特写道，"不是或至少不完全是为我而设的；可能也不应当是。它在被拍摄的事物所在场域中自行发生，像一种无法避免而又令人高兴的补充。"（1980, 47）巴特的理论框架正是以此颠覆了传统，将操作者手中的权力重新分配给了主体，偶然性与观看者，也正是因此，刺点成为了理解甘博摄影作品的有用工具，从而使我们得以通过偶然性来绕过甘博和他的摄影行动性，从而超越他的学科在那个时代对客观性的狭隘认识。

对于甘博而言，他的摄影作品中的知面在于他计划捕捉和记录的民族志细节，在于表现他那个年代中国农民、工人或城市居住者的生活。而对于观看者、对近一个世纪之后观看他作品的我们来说，它们的刺点则是以意料之外的细节的形式出现的，这些细节所揭示的往往更多是甘博的在场、西方的在场、时代变迁的在场。而甘博自己看到了什么。在一幅题为《搬运包裹Cot 5》的照片中，我们能看到一群或长或短的男子在山区里往一头驮骡的背上搬运货物（这些货物很有可能就是甘博自己的）。通过甘博的意图，即图像的知面，我们了解到了他那个时代的中国：我们看到人们的穿着与出行方式，也看到了城市以外的自然风貌。而额外附加给这张民族志课的刺点，是一个远离中心的青春期男孩，以一种桀骜不驯的姿态回望向甘博，而与这一镜像凝视相呼应的，是他身后焦距以外一个年龄更小的孩子的目光（或许带着更加强烈的情感）。甘博所感兴趣的是驮骡、工人，是民族志信息，而抓住我们注意力的却是那两个男孩回望的目光，它揭示出甘博的在场，并将照片的内涵从它的主体转变为相遇本身。这一刺点，这一在操作者的控制与意图之外的偶然性细节，使我们得以使用一种妨碍并扰乱了人类学家、社会科学家与摄影师地位的方式来解读甘博的作品，从而超越他的学科在那个时代对客观性的狭隘认识。

尽管有这样的陷阱存在，知面和刺点还是可以作为一种使客观性及摄影师的行动性去中心化的有用框架，因为它将注意力从甘博所意图的主体转移到了偶然性的细节上，不仅将行动者，也将摄影相遇本身囊括进来，从而重新构造了我们对摄影事件的理解。此外，在一些作品中，偶然性细节同时盖过了操作者与观看者的行动性，为理解巴特关于知面与刺点的理论阐述提供了新的思路。

尽管有这样的陷阱存在，知面和刺点还是可以作为一种使客观性及摄影师的行动性去中心化的有用框架，因为它将注意力从甘博所意图的主体转移到了偶然性的细节上，不仅将行动者，也将摄影相遇本身囊括进来，从而重新构造了我们对摄影事件的理解。对于巴特的这种表述，即主体在不知情的情况下被拍下的那一刻的惊讶，即主体在不清楚的情况下被拍下的那一刻的惊讶，巴特称之为“表演”。换言之，巴特认为，摄影最基本的核心在于揭露有关摄影主体的一些隐藏的东西。这一核心在巴特的摄影中尤为基础。因为主体对相机的不知情使得摄影师能够捕捉到主体某些隐藏得连他自己自己
都可能没意识到的东西。然而，也正是这个时刻（即“震惊”）意味着摄影师对主体完全的支配地位，因为主体无法通过有意识的摆拍来与摄影师共谋，因而完全无法对其形象产生任何影响或控制自己被揭露的内容。因此，虽然堪的派摄影体现了摄影这一媒介最基本元素，但它也是摄影师与主体之间的权力关系最悬殊的模式。由于摄影师的倾向性的缺席是刺点形成的必要条件，因此对于巴特来说，通过“震惊”行为获得的这种控制权意味着一种最为不利于私密相遇的摄影模式。巴特厌恶堪的派摄影的是，它是从摄影师支配主体身行动性的典范；这一支配使得观众与主体之间真诚私密的联系变得不再可能。在堪的派摄影中，摄影师的倾向性通过“震惊”行为介入进来，取代了原本由行动者因对相机知情产生的自己的倾向性（表现为摆拍）。有些其他评论家将这种对立解读为一种反戏剧性，但刺点可以从本体论上证明如此解读是错误的。

正是在这个连接点上，甘博的作品为我们提供了新的思路。虽然甘博在1908年至1932年间在中国拍摄的影像并非完全符合堪的派摄影的标准（事实上，许多拍摄是为他自己和中国利益预先设计好的），但其中还是有大量作品致力于拍摄公共空间中的日常生活，这在现在被称为“街头摄影”。在这些作品中，有的甚至是抓拍的，许多并不足，而是绝大多数则处在抓拍与摆拍之间的过渡区域。在这一过渡区域，在那些拍摄中所蕴含的街道和繁忙广场的照片中，其中的居住者表现出一种对摄影师的存在不存在程度的意识。甘博的图像因此得以回应巴特对堪的派摄影的批评。在这一系列的半堪的图像中，甘博的工人们展现出最经典的民族志信息，而我们能从中看到一些例子，其中偶然性干扰了影像，从而打破了摄影师的“震惊”企图。然而可以确定的是，背景中的一些人物，其中偶然性干扰了影像，从而打破了摄影师的“震惊”企图。然而可以确定的是，背景中的一些人物，其中偶然性干扰了影像，从而打破了摄影师的“震惊”企图。然而可以确定的是，背景中的一些人物，其中偶然性干扰了影像，从而打破了摄影师的“震惊”企图。然而可以确定的是，背景中的一些人物，其中偶然性干扰了影像，从而打破了摄影师的“震惊”企图。然而可以确定的是，背景中的一些人物，其中偶然性干扰了影像，从而打破了摄影师的“震惊”企图。然而可以确定的是，背景中的一些人物，其中偶然性干扰了影像，从而打破了摄影师的“震惊”企图。
的“震惊”会被偶然的镜像回望或意料之外的影子所颠覆（就像在先前那些照片中那样），而且当摄影师明确地试图拍摄相遇行为本身时，也会被主体自己的行动性所打乱。通过拒绝摄影师的设计，主体那些别扭的姿势与无力的目光将这些影像定位在抓拍与摆拍之外；刺点的不可控性在此表现为不配合的主体。并再度将这些照片摄入了过渡区域，只是这次是从摆拍领域进入了抓拍领域，而不是反过来。主体的行为可能真的是一种回应相机的存在，但它既反抗摆拍的共谋又反抗抓拍的“震惊”时，它就成为一种终极反戏剧性的颠覆性表演，一种反抗操作者的行动性、权力与假想的客观性的行为。

正是以这种方式，正是通过在抓拍与摆拍之间模糊的边界上解读他的民族志主体的行动性，甘博的二十世纪早期中国摄影作品能够最有效地丰富我们目前对那一时期的理解。他的影像为一个稀缺摄影记录的时期提供了丰富的民族志知识。而经过更为当代的反身方式重新解读后，这些作品也能打乱摄影师和民族志学者的地位，并将我们的注意力从他们的主体转移到民族志相遇上，而更重要的是，通过偶然性的难以预期与不合作性质，甘博的作品得以影响我们对行动性与相遇本身的理解。越过主体、摄影师与一个世纪时光的那些意料之外的凝视，未受控制的影子，拒绝合作的摆拍，这些偶然性的行动与主观反抗不仅动摇了关于主体性与摄影行动性的观念，而且也反抗了镜头与西方的权力与权威。
Recalcitrant Flesh: Stripping Away The Historical Burden Of Chinese Women’s Bodies

Ana Huang (Ana Huang is a PhD student in Cultural Anthropology at Duke University)

“In that sense, before the ‘body’ there is the ‘flesh,’ that zero degree of social conceptualization…”
– Hortense Spillers

BODY AND FLESH
Can women’s bodies speak? Can a feminist reading of photographic archives from the early twentieth-century China offer an unmediated historical glimpse into the lived experiences of women? With the exception of voice recordings and skeletons in graves, photography is perhaps the closest point of contact we have with the material lives of Chinese women, before mass literacy enabled the majority of women to write. Sidney Gamble took hundreds of apparently uncontrived photographs of women, their bodies imprinted onto the negative with absolute mechanical precision. Scholars of Chinese history are used to reading between the lines of Chinese male authors for glimpses of women’s realities in poems, fictions, political treatises, etc., but the photographic archive is able to bypass the interloping male voice, allowing us direct access to the elusive figure of the historical Chinese woman. Photography constitutes a material tracing of women’s bodies, a recording of corporeal speech. It is perhaps a potent lens for feminist reconstruction of the past. However, feminist projects that simply formulate counter-histories as a response to male-centered narratives fall into a familiar trap. Counter-histories are homologous methods of historical narrativization, as modern people endowed with the retrospective position perform reading practices on the site of women’s bodies in the early twentieth century. The physical body becomes a body of evidence in support of historical claims. The photo collection becomes a text upon which experts offer competing interpretations. The body is still being spoken for. Women’s subjectivities are still overwhelmingly defined by the body. The classic, liberal feminist approach to Gamble’s photo collection might, on first glance, offer reprieve from male-dominated discourses, by emphasizing women’s experiences and highlighting women in non-stereotypical roles. But such an alternative reading reenacts the imposition of historical meaning onto women’s bodies.

How then do we conduct a feminist historiography of the photographic archive that isn’t self-defeating? A different approach lies in the counter-intuitive refusal to be recognized and subsumed into the grand narratives of political history. The feminist race theorist Hortense Spillers makes a distinction between the body and the flesh, as that zero degree of social conceptualization. This nuanced distinction, when used to theorize Chinese women, opens up a peculiar way of examining historical photography. By stripping away the heavy burden of social meaning that covers the full surface of Chinese women’s bodies, we will allow the possibility of recalcitrant female flesh to break through, detangled from the web of historical narratives. Only then can we hear the incoherent screams and inaudible murmurs of female flesh, rising out of the photo print.

FOOT-BINDING AND THE HISTORICAL BURDEN
China’s image of modernization rests on the status of its women and their transition into qualified modern subjects. In the popular fashion of postcolonial and semi-colonial nations, women’s bodies serve as the battlefield whereupon imperialism, capitalism, nationalism and socialism measure their accomplishments. Their liberation was defined by and simultaneously legitimized national projects, as various markers of progress were chosen as the sites for liberation. Chinese women’s liberation in much of the twentieth century has largely been blessings from above, and mixed ones at that.

Gamble’s photographs captured the terse discourses surrounding foot-binding—a repeated trope central to the perception of China as backward at this time. While the photographer’s gaze shies away from intense examination of women’s feet in the public environment, the feet nevertheless demand the contemporary viewers’ attention, as overlaying narratives about modernity, missionaries, and feminism come into play. In the early twentieth century, to the Western world, foot-binding was a strange and barbaric practice marking patriarchy in China. To China itself, foot-binding symbolized a practice that must be eliminated in order for Chinese civilization to gain legitimacy on the modern, global stage. Much responsibility rested on women’s bodies, and little attention was paid to women’s agency in the anti-footbinding movement.

As Dorothy Ko demonstrated in her revisionist history of foot-binding, Cinderella’s Sisters, women with bound feet became framed as cultural embarrassments or femme fatales during the anti-footbinding movement. Christian missionaries sought to rectify the disfigurement of God’s creation, and their insistence on the preservation of the “heavenly foot” excluded any recognition of women’s power over their own bodies. Western and Chinese reformers, often male, undertook urgent measures to rid China of the backward, stubborn female bodies, enforcing foot-letting across the country, even as many women resisted the painful reversal process. First the foot was required to be bound, and then it was required to be unbound.

Figure 1: Chi Hua Men Chapel, Old Women
In Gamble’s collection, the occasional bound feet peek out of the images, as a site of tremendous contestation and social coding. Foot-binding, as well as foot-letting, was intended to turn female flesh into proper women’s bodies; it subjects unruly flesh to social codes. Narratives on the practice of foot-binding, whether sympathetic or critical, further bind the body to a historical framework. Well-intended feminist attempts can be as complicit in such a process as nation-building projects that proclaim women’s liberation as a complimentary benefit of socialism, and women’s freedom as a positive side-effect of marketization. Women’s bodies remain entangled in the web of historical narratives, and interpretations of their social presence in the photograph continue to capture raw flesh for the service of grand discourses. The contemporary feminist aversion to the legacy of Chinese foot-binding has unwittingly played into the notion of historical progress, which comforts us with the belief that Chinese women are, at the very least, more liberated today than they were before. What is left then for us to complain about?

REGULATED BODY, DISRUPTIVE FLESH

Gamble made meticulous captions for his photographs, noting ethnicity, religion, class, hairstyles – social markers that he was interested in delineating as a social scientist. But the faithful mechanical reproduction of the ephemeral moment, preserved in the photograph, betrays the intentions of the photographer and reveals many women’s resistance to the camera. Sometimes, women insert themselves into the visual composition, throwing the gaze back to the camera when it attempts to capture in stealth. Norms of etiquette had not been established between Chinese bodies and cameras. Without proprietary codes, women’s engagement with the camera, the white male cameraperson and the eventual public beholders of the image demonstrate an unruly attitude and an unabashed relation. Without speaking, they disrupt the credibility of visual documentation and challenge the photographer’s claim to realistic indexicality, with the scoffing look in their eyes, with their cocked eyebrows, with their pointed fingers.

The group of old beggar women resting on the pilgrimage to the Daoist temple on Miao Feng Shan, a mountain outside of Beijing, hints at a religious life that took some women great distances in non-domestic spaces, unrestricted by bound feet. On the other hand, a group of elderly Chinese women attending a Christian church in Chaoyang Men, Beijing stand in a row and pose for a group portrait in formal outfits. Their attempt at a standardized assemblage bears great contrast to the pilgrim women, who sit haphazardly on the ground, without bourgeois decorum, showing no deference for the camera. In the photographs of church women, we bear witness to a powerful mission project that not only sought to save souls, but also injected Foucauldian discipline of the body into Chinese modernity. The YMCA, in which Gamble participated, was part of the numerous reformist efforts aimed at increasing social productivity, managing populations, and teaching Chinese citizens new technologies of the self. The formation of biopolitical institutions such as schools, hospitals, and prisons contributed to the creation of self-regulating subjects. The female body is particularly subject to close scrutiny and social regulation, as the disciplinary techniques of modernity work in tandem with other national political projects.

Nevertheless, the attempt at posing by the church-going women is not a flawless performance, as each woman’s scattered gaze and awkward body composure indicate that photographic self-awareness was nascent in their bodies. Their stubborn flesh was not trained to hold themselves in uniform stillness before a photographer’s authoritative black box. We can almost hear Gamble’s exasperated requests for them to hold still: “Look at the camera, please!” Like the stubborn bound feet that cannot easily reverse itself, the recalcitrant flesh of the old women leaks out of their upright poses, if we know how to see. Their bodies appear, on first glance, to be pliant vessels under imperialist, religious, and technological demands. But an alternative kind of historiography allows us to recognize the subtle ruptures of the flesh beneath.

Figures 2: Pilgrim Women Resting; Chi Hua Men Chapel Old Women

Though Gamble sometimes composed shots and arranged people in front of his camera, women are not uniform in their bodily cooperation with the camera, as they look every other way and refuse to return the gaze when demanded to do so.
Beijing in the early twentieth century was not fully modern, yet it exhibited a kind of cosmopolitanism marking contact and the simultaneous coexistence of various worlds, made visible through women’s bodily presentations of costume, hair, and feet. In the Gamble collection, we catch a glimpse of the heterogeneous gender presentations practiced during a moment of social upheaval. Recognition of such inconsistencies constitutes a positive step towards the kind of feminist historiography that refuses assimilation by grander narratives. In the photographs, bound feet appear besides unbound ones. Female university students with short haircuts in protests coexist with Mongolian women in the palace, while female laborers and beggars mark another dimension of social difference. These bodies speak of various iterations of modernity, nationalism, and colonialism. They speak of women’s diverse responses to anti-foot-binding, the mass education movement, ethnic mixing, war, etc. The rich visual symbols in these photographs, especially on the surface of feminine bodies, are tempting materials, but we must not force historical women to speak as one body, or three, or as any number of historical representations. A different kind of historiography must begin by overlooking the social presentation on the body, in order to make room for the flesh underneath.

In Gamble’s haphazard shots of women hurrying past him, we can detect the arbitrariness of the captured image and its ultimate inability to serve as textual evidence for any conclusive readings of gender and social realities. In contrast to film and its embrace of linear time, the historical photograph is better positioned to jump out of time, carrying female flesh above the timeline in a momentary line of flight. The female subject becomes light, weightless on the black and white film. The split-second quality of photography makes it a medium that does, in a sense, allow unprecedented access to female flesh. Through its negation of temporal duration, the photograph denies us the habit of historical interpretation.

Women repeatedly create a strategic distance with the photographer, so that while Gamble succeeds in capturing their image, the flesh retains its ability to refuse incorporation into historical narratives. This interaction is highlighted in the photographs of two courtly women walking arm-in-arm, passing by and turning away from Gamble, during the Thanksgiving Day Presidential Review held in the Forbidden Palace. As Gamble hurries to capture their fascinating costumes on this special occasion, their turned backs make a mockery of his eagerness. The images contain the photographer's shadow in the foreground, dramatizing the relative positioning between the subject and the object in this interaction. The presence of Gamble's shadow, reaching after the two women as they walk away, is reminiscent of the stereotypical, impolite tourist who takes desperate shots of the exotic animal at the zoo as it strolls away with boredom and disdain. In the act of turning away, the female couple forms a homosocial intimacy that is inaccessible to the voyeuristic masculine gaze, even while their bodies are adorned by ornate symbols of ethnic, high-class femininity. Their flesh is not subsumed by the bodily display of gender, ethnicity, and class. In the refusal to be reduced to mere social positions, the flesh offers a potential for deep-rooted agency, something more than “women’s liberation.”
within the same frame brings the grand narratives suggested by this photograph to an overwhelming point of excess. The spectacle of the rich costumes underscores the over-burdening of women’s bodies. The scene begins to resemble theater, or the set of a film production. The spatial configuration of the four women’s bodies, juxtaposed against the shape of Gamble’s own Western hat, reveals our own insatiable desire to cull social meaning from the surface of women’s bodies.

A Chinese feminist consideration of the photographic archive, then, will not so much note the historical changes and tides of modernity that explain the different presentations of women’s bodies we see here, but instead collaborate with the two women’s simple turn away from the inquiring, external gaze. A refusal of reading, at least of certain modes of historical interpretation, constitutes an affirmation of recalcitrant female flesh, as it is stripped free of the overwhelming burden of historical progress. In fact, a feminist historiography that resists reading practices will actually make more room for illegible flesh to be included in our backward glances. We might then attend more closely to the unruly bodies that do not bear the recognizable markers of social positions.
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**Figure 6: Woman (“Old Goat”)**

In one of the most striking portraits Gamble took, a mysterious figure looks resolutely into the camera and commands direct engagement with the beholder. Yet we are unable to extract much conclusive meaning from the visual material. The Western style hat with a ribbon, cocked defiantly to the side; the angular, proud face; the well-worn Chinese shirt; the blurry rural background… In the archival preparations for the Gamble photo collection, one cataloger associated this photograph with a caption from Gamble that stated “old goat,” while another chose to put it into the category of “women.” Though archival work insists on some degree of categorization, it is impossible to assimilate this figure into a narrative of women, or men, without a level of uncertainty. Here we are encountering recalcitrant flesh that can no longer be gendered and sexed. We cannot easily apply queer or transgender identities to the figure, even with the best intentions. Then there is still the Western hat. The flesh here, wrapped in a conglomerate of Chinese and Western pieces of clothing, confounds our retrospective readings, revealing the inadequacy of any historical narratives. Did Gamble’s wife lend it to him/her as a prop for the portrait? Did he/she wear it while tilling the soil under the sun? Gender is not the only thing that can be thrown into question, as we ponder about this person’s adventures, without hopes of every receiving an answer. Though the flesh imprinted in the film is forever silent, it has managed to make fools of us all, try as we might to absorb the body into the social field. When the flesh truly commands our attention, as in this photograph, the setting becomes out of focus and meaningless—a tree, a house, a horizon, nothing historically meaningful, nothing that weighs down flesh. In the split-second flash of the camera, the flesh jumps out of time, stripped bare of the burden of history.

---

反叛的肉体：
剥离中国女性肉体上的历史负担

Ana Huang
(Ana Huang 是美国杜克大学文化人类学博士生)

“从这种意义上说，在‘身体’以前还有‘肉体’，它是社会概念化的起点…”
——霍顿斯·斯皮勒思

身体与肉体
女性的身体能说话吗？一篇对二十世纪早期中国摄影档案的女性主义解读，能让人毫无阻隔地瞥见女性历史生命经验的一隅吗？

在识字普及以前的年代，大多数中国女性还不能书写，除了录音与墓中的骨头，或许照片就是我们与她们的物质生活最近距离的接触了。甘博拍摄了上百张显然未加造作的女性照片，她们的身体被以机械化的绝对精准铭刻在底片之上。研究中国史的学者习惯于在男性中国作家的字里行间寻找着女性隐藏在诗歌、小说与政论中的真实存在，但摄影档案却能绕开干扰的男性声音，让我们得以直接触及历史上中国女性那隐隐绰绰的身影。摄影让女性身体留下了物质踪迹，它是肉体话语的记述，或许也会为历史的女性主义重构提供一个强大的镜头。

然而，如果仅仅只是将反历史的阐述作为对男性中心话语的回应，女性主义研究便会落入一个熟悉的陷阱。当享有回顾过往的特权的现代人在二十世纪早期的女性身体上展开阐释活动时，反历史其实是与历史叙事化同出一源的方法。物质的身体变成了用以支撑历史观点的一堆证据。而摄影作品则成为了专家们竞相解读的文本。身体仍然是被言说的。女性的主体性仍然主要被身体所定义。如果使用经典的自由主义女性主义方法来探讨甘博的摄影作品，第一眼或许会显得像是缓冲了男性主导话语，因为它强调女性的经验及非刻板印象角色。但这一非传统解读却仍只是重复了将历史意义强加于女性身体之上的做法。

那么，我们应怎样对这些摄影档案开展女性主义的历史学，才不至于陷于自我否定的境地？新的途径在于反直觉地拒绝被辨识并纳入政治历史的宏大叙事中。女性主义种族理论家霍顿斯·斯皮勒思提出“身体”与“肉体”的区分，将其作为社会概念化的起点。将这一细微差别的区分应用于对中国女性的理论化时，便为审视历史摄影另辟了蹊径。当我们剥离覆满中国女性身体表面的社会意义重负，反叛的女性肉体才会从历史叙事之网中突破而出。只有这样，我们才能听到女性肉体那语无伦次的尖叫与微不可闻的低语从照片中传出。

缠足与历史重负
中国的现代化形象依托于中国女性的生存状态与她们向合格的现代主体的转变。在后殖民与半殖民国家，女性的身体往往变成了帝国主义、资本主义、国族主义与社会主义比拼成果的战场。随着不同的进步标志被选择成为解放的场所，她们的解放被国家计划所定义并同时合法化。在二十世纪的大部分时间里，中国女性的解放在很大程度上是来自上方的赐予，偶尔也掺杂一些其他因素。

甘博的摄影捕捉到了围绕着缠足的主要话语——而缠足是将彼时的中国视为落后的观点中不断重复着的核心隐喻。虽然摄影师的目光在公共场合回避着对女性身体的全面检查，但缠足仍然值得当代观众的注意。因为有关现代性、传教士与女性主义话语都在此处层层叠加地发挥着影响。在二十世纪早期，对于西方世界来说，缠足是一种奇怪而野蛮的行径。它代表着中国的奇特之处。而对于中国自身而言，缠足则象征着一种为使中华文明在现代社会舞台上获得合法性而必须废除的行为。许多责任落在了女性的身体上，而她们竟然有人注意到在反缠足运动中的行动性。

正如高彦在其修正主义的缠足史《缠足：“金莲崇拜”盛极而衰的演变》一书中所述，反缠足运动将缠了足的女子构造为文化羞耻或是红颜祸水。基督教传教士们想要废除上帝造物的畸形，而他们对于保护“天足”的坚持却将一切对女性身体自主权力的承认都排除在外。西方和中国的改革者们（通常是男性）采取了迫切的措施以使中国摆脱那落后的、顽固的女性身体，他们在全国范围内强制推行放足，即便许多女性反抗这一痛苦的逆向过程。

在甘博的作品集中，偶尔会有缠起的小脚在照片中出现，并引起大量争论及对其的社会编码。缠足，一如放足，都是以将女性肉体转变为合乎体统的女性身体为目的；它让桀骜不驯的肉体屈服于社会规范。关于缠足行为的叙述，无论是同情或批评的，往往都进一步将身体绑定在某个历史框架之上。在这一过程中，出于善意的女性主义尝试可以转变成国家建设计划一样，同谋着将女性解放颂扬为社会主义的益处。而女性自由则成为了经济市场的正面效应。女性的身体依然被历史叙事之网纠缠，而对于她们在照片中的身份阐释则仍旧是捕捉鲜活肉体来服务于宏大话语。当代女性主义对中国缠足传统的厌弃不知不觉地落入了进步史观的圈套，并一边用如此信念安慰着我们：当今的中国女性至少比过去解放了一些。那我们还有什么可抱怨的呢?

被管制的身体，扰乱性的肉体
甘博为其摄影作品取标题十分严谨细致，不忘提及族裔、地区、阶级与发型——这些是这位社会科学家喜欢用以进行描绘的社会标记。但照片保留下的对这短暂瞬间忠实的机械化重现却违背了摄影师的意图，揭示出许多女性对相机镜头的反抗。有时，女性将自己插入到这一视觉创作中，在相机试图悄悄偷拍时向它投回凝视的目光。在中国，身体与相机之间还未曾在礼仪规范中建立起一套礼仪规范。没有版权代码的烦扰，女性在与相机、与白人男性摄影师及与最终图像的公众观看者的交互中展现出一种不甘束缚的态度与
毫无羞怯的关系。她们未曾言说，却用她们那嘲笑的眼神、挑起的眉毛、指点的手指扰乱了视觉纪录的可信度，并挑战了摄影师所宣称的照片对现实的索引性。

虽然甘博有时会预先编排一些拍摄并在相机前安排人们的动作，但女性在她们与相机的身体合作中并不整齐划一，她们看向各种别的方向，当要求回望向镜头时却拒绝那么做。一组老年乞丐妇女正在去往北京城外妙峰山道观的朝圣途中休息，照片暗示着宗教生活将一些女性带到离家庭生活很远的空间中，不受缠足的限制。而在另一张照片中，一组年长的中国妇女前往一座位于北京朝阳门的教堂参拜，她们站成一排，穿着正装为群像摆着姿势。她们试图组成标准化组合的努力与朝圣妇女们形成巨大对比，后者杂乱地坐在地上，不带任何中产阶级式的端庄礼貌，对相机没有表现出任何顺从。

表现教堂妇女的照片让我们见证到一个强势的传教计划，它不仅想要拯救灵魂，而且还将福柯式的身体规训注入到中国的现代性中。甘博所参加的基督教青年会就是无数改革努力中的一份子，这些改革致力于增加社会生产、控制人口并教会中国公民对自我身体技术。生命政治机构的形成，如学校、医院和监狱，为创造自我管制的主体作出贡献。当现代性的规训技巧与其他国族政治计划联手，女性的身体受到了尤为细致的审查与社会管制。不过，教堂妇女的摆拍尝试也并非是毫无瑕疵的表演，每位妇女眼角的挑动、眉间的皱眉与目光都不容忽视。在相机前，她们的眼神、挑起的眉毛和指点的手指似乎在挑战摄影师的权威。

历史学与飞溅的瞬间

二十世纪的北京还不是完全现代的，但它已经展现出一种以不同世界的共存与接触为标志的现代主义。这通过女性用身体展示的服饰、发型和脚而变得可见。在甘博的作品集中，我们得以瞥见一丝那个社会变动的年代多样的性别表现方式。对这一不协调的承认是向拒绝被宏大叙事同化的女性主义历史学迈出的积极一步。在这些照片中，缠起的小脚与未缠的足部并排出现，出于抗议而剪成短发的女大学生与宫殿里的蒙古女性同时存在，而女性劳工与乞丐也标志了另一维度的社会差异。这些身体不断重复着说明现代性、国族主义与殖民主义，它们言说着女性对反缠足、教育普及运动、多族裔混合、战争等事件的多样回应。这些照片中丰富的视觉符号（尤其是在女性身体表面），是诱人的素材，但它们不能强迫历史上的女性作为一个身体，或三个，或任意数量的历史再现来说话。一种不同的历史学应当始于对这些诸于身体之上的社会表现的无视，这样才能为隐藏其下的肉体腾出空间。

虽然照片保留下了承载着阶级、种族、流行风格、教育水平等信息的能指，但它也将身体冻结在了那一时刻，在那被剥离了时间连续性的“飞溅的瞬间”。这一瞬间具有将女性身体从历史时间中解放出来的潜力，因为它既不提供前景也不提供背景。我们无法确切知道在此前或此后发生了什么，只是在太阳的耀眼和摄影师的不请自来中，她的微笑或皱眉？是在热切的摄影师不请自来地接近她之前，她是否在为太阳的耀眼而皱眉吗，或者在热切的摄影师不请自来地接近她之前，她是否在微笑？她是否在关心着新闻里昨天举行的抗议，或者为明天的晚宴客人而感到激动？她如此匆匆地是要去哪里——是去拜访她的母亲，还是去赴一段违禁的风流韵事，或者去集市走一遭？下一秒的潜在性威胁着要驳斥对照片捕捉下的这一时刻的任何阐释。讽刺的是，这无头无尾的飞溅瞬间反而将肉体从时间性
在甘博杂乱拍摄的各种匆匆走过的女性中，我们能探出所捕捉到的图像的任意性，它无法作为文本依据支撑任何对性别与社会现实的有结论性的解读。与电影及其线性时间不同，历史照片更倾向于从时间中跳跃，让女性的肉体在短暂的飞跃中超越于时间线之上。女性的肉体在黑白胶卷上变得身轻如燕，毫无重量。照片的飞溅瞬间在某种意义上使其成为了一种允许与女性肉体获得前所未有的直接接触的媒体。通过对连续时间的否定，照片拒绝了我们进行历史性阐释的习惯。

女性不断地创造出与摄影师的策略性距离，以至于甘博虽然成功拍下了她们的影像，她们的肉体却依然保留着拒绝被整合进历史叙事中去的能力。她们不断地与摄影师保持一种距离，以至于甘博虽然成功拍下了她们的影像，她们的肉体却依然保留着拒绝被整合进历史叙事中去的能力。在她们转身离开的镜头中，这对一位年轻女子从画面右侧进入，同样背对著镜头，穿着完全另一种风格的服装，表现出她们自己的阶级、种族和婚姻状况。同一画面中两对人物出乎意料的组合使这张照片所暗示的宏大叙事达到了过度的极限。壮观的华丽服饰突显了加诸女性身体之上的过重负担。这一场景开始变得像一场戏剧，或是电影布景。四对年轻女子的身影之间的空白布置与甘博自己的西式帽子的影子并置，反应出我们自己难以满足的将社会意义从女性身体表面剔除的欲望。

因此，对这一摄影档案的中国女性主义的分析并不会太多提及历史的变迁或现代性的浪潮，用以解释我们在这种看到的对女性身体的不同表现。而是和那两位对窥探的外部目光直截了当反对的女性合作，拒绝解读，至少拒绝那些特征化的历史解读，构成了对反叛的女性肉体的再度肯定。因为它剥离了压倒一切的进步史观的负担。事实上，拒绝解读行为的女性主义历史学将为那晦暗难辨的肉体确实留出更多空间，聚焦其难以满足的将社会意义从女性身体表面剔除的欲望。

因此，对这一摄影档案的中国女性主义的分析不会太多提及历史的变迁或现代性的浪潮，用以解释我们在这种看到的对女性身体的不同表现。而是和那两位对窥探的外部目光直截了当反对的女性合作，拒绝解读，至少拒绝那些特征化的历史解读，构成了对反叛的女性肉体的再度肯定。因为它剥离了压倒一切的进步史观的负担。事实上，拒绝解读行为的女性主义历史学将为那晦暗难辨的肉体确实留出更多空间，聚焦其难以满足的将社会意义从女性身体表面剔除的欲望。
Movement Defining the Modern: The role of human effort in creating Modern China

Sidney Gamble travelled and captured a changing China in his various trips to the country in the early part of the twentieth century. His images provide an intriguing ingress into post-Qing Empire China and prove to be a window into everyday life in China during a time of tumultuous change. My interest is not only in the images themselves but also in our gaze as spectators. There are two interventions embedded within this narrative. The first intervention is Sidney Gamble's visit and photography of China in the twentieth century. The second is ours, as a twenty-first-century audience. Gamble functions in various capacities during his many trips to China. As tourist, traveler, surveyor and member of the YMCA, he dons several roles at various moments. Three of Gamble's perspectives are of concern here: Gamble's role in the Mass Education Movement, his work as a surveyor, and his aesthetic intervention through photography. Gamble moreover was in China during some of the key moments approaching modernity. He and his camera were thus key witnesses of this change.

China was moving into a new era with rapid changes. The Qing Empire had given way to a Republic, Sun Yat Sen had emerged as a popular leader, and the mobilization of people towards a changing regime was in full swing. We can see the movement of historical time in movements for socio-political change: the rickshaw pullers strike leading to the May Fourth Movement, for example. The change from monarchy to republicanism was thus motivated by a movement and mobilization of people (Figures 2 and 4). With changes in regime we can also see changes in systems, as for example, with the Mass Education Movement (Figure 5) or the prison system (Figure 8). At the individual level we see the physiognomy of people in motion captured through still photography and thereby frozen in time. Gamble for example, through his fascination in documenting street life, captures on celluloid rickshaw pullers and farm laborers, challenging stereotypes about “city life.” Movement consequently defined this period, be it the large institutional and structural changes sweeping the country or the effects of such changes on the individual. But how was this change manifesting itself on the environment?

The census completed in Peking by Gamble, for example, is the beginning of a modern trend towards the disappearing “individual” or human figure. People were now commutable to statistics on paper, and in practice the coming of the machine threatened to remove the human figure from the city street. Had modernization meant industrialization devoid of the human figure? Had the tram, for example, replaced a rickshaw puller in twentieth-century Beijing? The interaction between the human and his environment will be of thematic interest in this paper, as the dynamics between man and his environment change. Two ideas immediately emerge as important thematic elements endemic to our discussion of a modern China: movement and environment. Movement is organically entwined within this project through the aforementioned interventions; more importantly, movement begets change. These changes, both structural and individual, are reflected in the relationship between the human figure and his environment and therefore become central to our inquiry. These two ideas will therefore function as vanguards of this paper.

What, however, do I mean by movement? Gamble’s work is situated at the junction of a historic and aesthetic understanding of movement. Movement in Gamble’s work also functions in a dual capacity, as a historical determinant of modernity and as an aesthetic condition of modern living. Movement is both—the corporeal body caught on film and the changing China slowly pushed into “the modern.” Modernity for China was a definite move away from Confucianism and monarchy towards the appropriation of “scientific thinking” or reason. The 1920s in China was the time of many movements towards a changing society, determined on the establishment of class consciousness among the laboring classes transcending regional or local parochialism. As a result we can see the Rickshaw Pullers, Oil Press Workers, the Machinists, and the Railroad Workers union movements coming to be associated with the changing face of Chinese society. Mobilization of the masses became the priority of those in power. The privileging of the working class was historically determined and it would be actualized through a restructuring of labor and the mobilization of “bodies” for the cause. Change was the mantra, and mobilization and movement of labor became the vehicles of this change. This period
was also a time of change in public welfare systems. The health, education, and prison systems were all being restructured and “modernized.” Transportation had been revolutionized by the coming of trams and trains, and all of this entailed a movement towards a different era in Chinese history. In other words, change was redefining China, in a significant way and this change is best understood in the movement of both individuals and systems. But how do we develop an aesthetic understanding of movement?

Among many artists and theorists in twentieth-century Europe who experimented with concepts of movement, time, and the human figure is the Czechoslovakian choreographer and dance theorist Rudolf Laban, who employed these concepts within his art. For Laban, “Man moves in order to satisfy a need. He aims by his movement at something valuable to him.” This value can be both spiritual and intellectual or material. He continues, “[s]o movement evidently reveals many different things…. Movement may be influenced by the environment of the mover. So, for instance, the milieu in which action takes place will color the movements of an actor or an actress.” That is, the environment shapes movement.

This image foregrounds a man winnowing. The movement is captured not only through his physiognomy and the positioning of his shadow but also through the leaves frozen against gravity. We see effort etched in every angle of this picture, an image that has itself been mechanically captured. The background centers on another working figure as well. More significantly we clearly see movement and effort. The effort behind his movements is aimed at securing an “object of value,” in this case the cost of living. We can observe how the environment has affected his movement. His movements are determined by his economic environment; he is perhaps a farm laborer and it is this environment that moulds the ways in which his body moves. The occupation is unequivocally etched in the folds and creases of his clothing, visible in the image. Like the movement, these folds are transitory and evoke the fleeting quality of movement. It is this embedded dynamism that points us towards the mobility of its central figure, a quality that is enhanced by the following image.

Figure 2: Rickshaws

Figure 2 is of the rickshaw pullers of Beijing. Their work is movement. Their figures suggest movement and their labor is defined by movement—the movement of people and goods, the movement of the rickshaw pullers themselves, and also the movement of time, rickshaw pullers being one of the laboring classes mobilized for change. They are affected by their environment, in that their labor and effort are shaped by the demands of that economic environment. But they are also effecting change in their environment through participation in the labor movements. In Figures 1 and 2, the environment is clearly shaping the effort of the human beings, but as discussed earlier China was in a state of change. How did the environment change and what effect did it have on the human figures embedded within it?

This image foregrounds a man winnowing. The movement is captured not only through his physiognomy and the positioning of his shadow but also through the leaves frozen against gravity. We see effort etched in every angle of this picture, an image that has itself been mechanically captured. The background centers on another working figure as well. More significantly we clearly see movement and effort. The effort behind his movements is aimed at securing an “object of value,” in this case the cost of living. We can observe how the environment has affected his movement. His movements are determined by his economic environment; he is perhaps a farm laborer and it is this environment that moulds the ways in which his body moves. The occupation is unequivocally etched in the folds and creases of his clothing, visible in the image. Like the movement, these folds are transitory and evoke the fleeting quality of movement. It is this embedded dynamism that points us towards the mobility of its central figure, a quality that is enhanced by the following image.

Figure 3: Sprinkling the Street

Figures 3 and 4 capture human figures in motion, seated in the rickshaws, pulling the rickshaws, but most importantly the two figures in the foreground in both images are spraying water to calm the dusty summer storms convulsing the city. The men are part of the cleanliness and hygiene drive that was itself part of a larger structural change of different systems. However, how do we read these images as an audience? Laban notes that movement is fuelled by effort and rest is the only transitory state of being, for it is effort and movement that characterize a human being. For Laban this effort is experienced by an onlooker as rhythm. Our gaze is trained not at the effort behind the move-
ment but on the movement itself as rhythm. The experience here is not only of the person involved in the movement but also of the gaze of another human following the bodily efforts and exertions of a figure in motion. We can observe the effort intrinsic in every movement of the central human figures in both images. The rhythm of movement conveyed through not only their physiognomy but also through the spray and play of water. Moving against gravity and simultaneously frozen in space, the movement of water mirrors and is emblematic; indeed it is an extension of human movement and effort. More significantly, while the previous images explicitly showcased the ways in which the environment affected the human, Figures 3 and 4 exemplify a reversal in this process. The repartee between the figures and water highlights the ways in which man was taming and changing his environment.

These two images also underline the connections between the human figures and the change in systems, especially when compared to Figure 1. In both sets of images, we see the same form of human effort. Human economy is tied in with this effort at reorganization and restructuring. While the figure in Figure 1 is contributing his labor through the act of winnowing, he is not directly absorbed into this system of change. The two figures who are part of the hygiene drive, however, are directly connected to the structural change. The following images show even more explicitly how Gamble's work captures the way human figures are mobilized in the name of the modernization movement.

Figures 5 and 6 capture various moments from the Mass Education Movement during the 1920s. Figures 5 and 6 depict students engaged in the movement for mass education and addresses our thoughts on mobilization of people as a characteristic feature of twentieth-century Chinese movements for change. Gamble was involved with Y.C. James Yen's Mass Education Movement and actively documented its efforts for awareness building and mobilization. His photographs of schools and the YMCA's mobilization drives are ample evidence of his interest in these structural changes. These images not only inform us of the structural changes ongoing in education but also transform our understanding of movement and mobilization in the twentieth century, especially when we consider the organization and composition of the bodies, the human figures. In the images from prisons, schools, and hospitals, we can see bodies being disciplined, governed, or otherwise manipulated by the systems they are embedded within. The bodies morph into uniformity and can be easily categorized, not unlike a neat column of statistics. This fact becomes visually apparent when we consider the next image.

In Figure 7 we see children being structured and organized in files and rows. The individuality of the expressions captured in this image is undercut by the homogeneity imposed through uniforms and institutionalized behavior. Gamble is a central figure not only in capturing this moment but in actualizing it through his surveys. For one of the first steps towards “modernity” is the replacement of the human figure with numbers and statistics. Once human figures fit into neat columns, the process of control and discipline can begin. This thought is more cogently examined in the images from the prisons. Consider Figure 8, for example.

The human figures could be workers in a factory. However, the fact that it is a prison immediately transforms this space into a place reminiscent of a school. The prisoners here can be seen weaving cloth: it is a space for inclusion back into society. This fact should not be mistaken or misconstrued as the prison system belonging to the mainstream. It is a space for train-
ing and the gaining of skills, similar to a school or university. However, it vitally differs from the educational system when we consider different processes of discipline being enacted. The significant idea to engage with is the process by which bodies were being changed or transformed by the changes in structures and institutions. Schools and prisons operate of course in very different milieus of society, but they are bound together nonetheless by the changes convulsing them at the moment. Beyond the human figures and the structures in flux, the change that significantly altered the environment was the beginning of mass mechanization.

Figure 8: Prison, Weaving Cloth

Figure 9: First Street Car

Figure 9, the coming of the first street cars to Beijing, is an image of and from a new China, a mechanized and “modern” society. Will the rickshaw pullers be replaced by a machine? Can this city space transform completely to accommodate this modern beast, and what would be the effect of such a transformation on the figure of the human? In Figure 9, the tram is figured centrally. The humans are marginalized and indeed made impersonal. Unlike the other images we are not drawn to the human figures but to this symbol of the mechanical. For Laban, movement can be voluntary or involuntary, that is without involving a conscious decision. Involuntary movements for him are especially embedded in modern societies where human beings have been subsumed by industry. Human beings become a part of the mechanical industry and their movements therefore become automatic. Individuals who are a part of the system perform movements without any conscious thought or contemplation. For Laban, movement or effort has been sapped of its vitality: the human actor. In engaging in repetitive motion, man finds himself becoming just a part of a machine and thereby growing far removed from his own energy. Mechanization bleeds the human being out of the landscape. Can we see this process unraveling in China?

Furthermore, for Laban movement was the cohesive force behind architecture, painting, and sculpture, to name a few forms, in the ancient world. Movement was central to our daily lives and the creative process. The modern condition for him is at a disjunct with this notion, as human energy is sapped by the machines. Rhythm and movement which should have been integral parts our lives therefore become divorced from our everyday mechanical lives. Are the people truly detached in these images, and have the machines taken over this landscape? In the Chinese context, is the human architecture of the city being replaced by the industrial and the mechanized? China in reality was creating its own modernity. Modernity, at least in Laban’s European context, was replacing human movement with the mechanical. Machines were frequently employed to signal the coming of modernity but always at the expense of the human figure. China, however, is uniquely positioned as it is the human figure that shaped modernity; the mechanical could never become a stand-in for the human, as is evidenced in Gamble’s work. The tram is displacing the human, but the human still fills and indeed cannot be contained within its borders. The rickshaw puller is a fundamental part of the landscape, on the same stage as the car, or the students from the mass education movement. In the image we can see an implement, the pitchfork, but it is the human figure that is employing it gainfully. The rickshaw pullers are a dynamic part of the environment in flux. Systems are being restructured by the human hand. The human, after all was mobilizing a new China!

The human is never completely disassociated from this landscape; he finds new ways of inserting himself within this idea of the modern. Venturing further, Gamble’s work is also an act of the mechanized—the camera capturing the human. But it is the perspective, or rather view that remains inherently human. The perspective here belongs to Gamble, another human remaking the ways in which the modern Chinese landscape is remembered. The human is therefore integral not only to the context and content of the image but also the making of the image. It is therefore befitting that I conclude with an image, wrought by the human hand but ultimately a mechanical reproduction. The image taken by Gamble coalesces in a single frame some of the key concepts of human movement and mobility as captured by a camera. The image taken from what appears to be a train, frames another form of transportation, a boat. It perfectly ensonces the dual conditions of a uniquely Chinese modernity: the human and the mechanized. The train reminds us of a ma-
chines cutting through the landscape, while the man on the boat fuelling the boat’s movement with his own effort aligns himself on the other end of the spectrum. Both are immediately set up in contrast while also distinctively combining to perform what I’ve come to define as the Chinese Modern.

Figure 10: Boat from Train
定义现代的运动：
创造现代中国的人的力效

Kshama Kumar
（Kshama Kumar 是杜克大学历史系博士生）

西德尼·甘博在他二十世纪早期的多次游历中捕捉到了一个变化中的中国。他的照片为走进晚清帝国提供了十分吸引人的途径，也被公认为是一扇通往动荡年代中国的日常生活的窗口。而笔者的兴趣不仅在于这些图像本身，还在于我们作为观看者观赏它们的目光。这些照片中内含着两种叙事干预。第一种是西德尼·甘博在二十世纪中国的访问和拍摄。第二种是我们作为二十一世纪的观众的干预。甘博在他对中国多次访问中以各种不同身份参与到社会中。他作为游客、旅行者、调查者或是基督教青年会（YMCA）成员。他在某些时刻同时兼多重角色。在甘博的各种视角中，有三个将在此处做探讨：甘博在中国平民教育运动中的角色，他作为调查者的工作，以及他在摄影过程中的美学干预。另外，甘博也经历了一些中国迈向现代性的关键时刻。他和这些照片成为了这一转变的重要见证。

当时的中国以飞速的变化进入了一个崭新时代。清帝国已让位于共和政体，广受欢迎的领袖孙中山已经出现，对人民创建新政权的动员也已全面发起。我们可以在社会-政治变迁的运动中看到历史时间的行进：比如，黄包车夫罢工推动了五四运动。从君主制向共和主义的转变由此被人民的社会动员与运动所激发（图2和图4）。伴随政权的变更，我们也能看到各类体系的变化，例如平民教育运动（图5）或监狱系统（图8）。在个体层面，被静物摄影所捕捉到并冻结在时间里的相貌神情也不断发生着改变。那些甘博出于对记录街头生活的痴迷而捕捉在赛璐璐胶片上的黄包车夫与农场工人，就是这样的例子，他们挑战着有关“城市生活”的刻板印象。因此，是运动定义了这一时期，无论是大规模的、横扫整个国家的制度与结构变化，还是这些改变对个体产生的影响。然而，这种变化是如何从环境中产生的呢？

例如，甘博在北京完成的人口普查，就是“个体”或人趋于消失的现代趋势的开端。人开始被替换为纸上的统计数据，而在实际生活中，机器的来临也威胁要把人的形体从城市街道上驱除。现代化真的意味着不再有人的工业化吗？比如在二十世纪的北京，有轨电车是否真的已经取代了人力黄包车？本文主要讨论的主题即是，人与其环境是如何随着其间的关系变化而发生变化的。这立即就让人想到了两个概念，它们是有关现代中国的讨论中特有的重要主题元素：一是运动，二是环境。运动通过前述两种干预手段有机地缠绕在现代化方案中；而更重要的是，运动孕育着变化，这些体制与个人的变化，正体现在人与其环境的关系中。因此，这一关系对于本文的探究来说至关重要。因此，这两个概念将成为本文的先导。

然而，这里所说的运动究竟是指什么呢？甘博的作品处在对运动的历史学与美学阐释的交叉点上，其作品中的运动也有着双重作用。它既是一种现代性的话语决定因素，又是一种现代生活的美学条件。胶卷上捕捉到的物质身体，与变动着被缓慢推向“现代”的中国——这两种都是运动。对于中国来说，现代性既是明确脱离孔儒之道与君主制、转而借用“科学思维”亦即理性，二十年代的中国正是许多运动风起云涌、社会发生转变的时候。由劳动阶级超越于地方主义或本地狭隘主义之上的阶级意识建立所决定。其结果就是，黄包车夫、榨油工、机器厂工人以及铁路工人的工会运动被与社会变化的面孔联系起来。发动群众成为了当权者的首要任务。工人阶级的优先地位被历史地决定，而它也将通过劳动结构的重组以及对“身体”的动员来实现。“改变”是当时的颂词，而改变的载体则是动员与工人运动。这一时期也是公共福利体系发生转变的时候。医学、教育与监狱系统都被改建并“现代化”了。交通被有轨电车与火车的到来所革新，而所有这些都不可能把中国历史向一个全新的纪元推进。换言之，变化显著地重新定义着中国，而个人与体制层面的运动则是这一变化最好的体现。然而，我们又该怎样对运动进行美学的阐释呢？在二十世纪欧洲众多使用运动、时间与人体概念进行实验的艺术家与理论家中，有一位是捷克斯洛伐克的舞蹈编导与理论家鲁道夫·拉班（Rudolf Laban），他把这些概念运用于他的艺术创作中。拉班认为，“人为满足一种需求而运动。他运动的目的是某样对他来说有价值的东西，”这种价值既可以是精神与思想的，也可以是一件物体的。他继续写道：“所以运动显著地揭示出许多不同的东西——运动可能被发出动作者的环境所影响，所以，譬如，行为所发生的社会语境会给行为者的动作染上颜色。”亦即，环境塑造了运动。

图1：农民操场
这张照片以一位正在扬谷的男子为前景。这一运动被捕捉下来的不仅有男子的神态与他影子的位置，同时还有建筑物在空中飘荡的叶子。我们看到，这幅被机械化地捕捉到的画面中，每个角落都反映出力效（effort）的痕迹。背景聚焦在另一个劳动着的人形上，这里运动与力效显得更加明显清晰。在工具的运动背后，力效是以保护一件“有价值的物体”为前提的。在那个例子中就是生存的开销，我们可以观察到环境如何影响了他们的运动。他的运动被他的经济环境所决定；他也许是一位农场工人，而正
有的过渡状态，因为力效与运动是人所特有的。 拉班认为，力效会被旁观者体验为节律。我们的目光并没有被训练得足以洞察运动背后的力效，而仅能将运动本身视作一种节律。因此，这种经验不仅属于运动所涉及的人，也属于那追随着运动中人物的力效与努力的另一人的目光。在两幅图像中，我们都能在中心人物的每一种运动中观察到内在的力效。运动的节律不仅通过他们的面部神态、也通过水的泼洒与舞动表达出来。水被反重力地移动并同时被固定在半空中，这一运动是反映性也是象征性的；事实上，它是人的运动与力效的延伸。更重要的是，之前的照片明确地展示了环境影响人的方式，但图3与图4则例证了一个与此相反的过程。人对水的随机应变突显出人驯服和改变其所处环境的方式。

图4：泼水养路

另外，这两幅图像也强调了人与体系变化之间的关系，尤其与图1形成对比。在两组照片中，我们看到了同样形式的人的力效。人的经济与这一为了重组改建而进行的力效衔接了起来。虽然图1中的人物通过扬谷的行为贡献了他的劳动力，但他并未直接被纳入到变化系统中。而卫生倡议行动中的这两个人物却直接地与社会的结构性变化产生联系。而下面的照片甚至将更加明确地展现出，甘博的作品如何捕捉到人在现代化运动中被动员起来的方式。

图5：1919年6月3日，基督教青年会学生游行

是这一环境塑造了他身体运动的方式。从照片中可以看到，他的职业毫不含糊地从他衣服的折痕与褶皱中显露出来。就像这个动作一样，这些褶皱也是一瞬之间的。它们唤起了这一运动的短暂流逝性。正是这深埋其中的动态感让我们看到画面中心人物的流动性，而这一属性在下一张照片中更为强烈。
图6：1919年6月3日，基督教青年会学生讲演，周围的警察

图5至图6捕捉到了二十年代平民教育运动中的各种瞬间。图5描绘了参与平教游行的学生，而图6则涉及到了本文所思考的问题，即二十世纪中国的改变社会运动中特有的对群众的动员。甘博参与了晏阳初的平民教育运动，并积极记录下了其意建设与社会动员的努力。他那些有关学校与YMCA动员倡议的照片充分证明了他对这些结构变化的兴趣。这些照片不仅让我们了解到当时教育系统中所发生着的结构变动，也改变了我们对于二十世纪社会运动与动员的解读，尤其是关于其对身体、亦即对人的组织与构建的思考。在有关监狱、学校和医院的照片中，我们能看到身体是如何被规训、被治理、或是被它们身处的体系所操纵的。身体被变得整齐划一，并能被轻易地归类，就像统计表上干净整齐的一列。当我们分析下面这张照片时，这一事实使得上观上变得更为明显。

图7：美国公理会办女子寄宿学校，中学教室

在图7中，我们看到儿童被组织、排列成整齐的行列。照片中所捕捉到的个体性的表达被校服与制度化行为强加其上的同质性所破坏。甘博不仅捕捉下了这一瞬间，而且也通过他的调查活动参与实现了这一场景。这一迈向“现代性”最初的步伐之一就是，用数字符数数据来代替人。一旦人被装进整洁的列表中，控制与规训就能开始了。这一论述在有关监狱的照片中将体现得更为充分，比如图8。

图8：监狱，织布

人也可以是工厂里的工人。然而，这是一所监狱。这个事实瞬间就把这一空间转化成了一个令人联想到学校的空间。人被改变，或是被体制结构变化所影响了。当然，学校和监狱是在非常不同的社会文化语境中运行的，但无论如何，它们在照片中的这一时刻还是被撼动了它们的社会变化捆绑在一起。而比人与不断变化的结构更为显著地改变的是环境的，即大规模机械化的开始。
个现代野兽的居住吗？这样一种转型又将对人产生怎样的影响？
在图9中，有轨电车成了中心角色。人被边缘化，甚至被变得没有人性了。与前述照片不同，我们的注意力并没有被引到人物上，而是被引到机械的象征物上。对于拉班来说，运动可以是自愿的，也可以是非自愿的——亦即不涉及一个有意识的决定。他认为，非自愿的运动尤其根植于现代社会，人类被纳入工业之中。人变成了机械工业的一部分，而他们的运动也因此变成自动化的——作为系统一部分的个体在进行运动时没有任何有意识的思想或意图。对于拉班来说，运动或成效被榨干了生命力，而这生命力正是作为行为者的人。在参与重复性动作时，人发现自己变得仅仅是机器的一部分，被剥离了他们自己的生命能量。机械化将人从整个图景中赶出。我们真的会在中国看到这个过程逐渐展开吗？

此外，拉班认为，在古代世界，运动是建筑、绘画和雕塑等各种艺术形式背后的粘合力。运动是我们日常生活与创造过程的核心。而现代社会的条件对于他来说是背离这一观点的。因为人的生命能量被机器榨干了。节律和运动本应是我们在生命中不可分离的部分。现在却远离了我们的日常机械生活。这些照片中的人真的是冷漠的吗？机器真的已经占领了整个社会吗？在中国的社会语境下，城市中人的建筑已被工业的、机械化的建筑所取代了吗？现实中，中国在创造着它自己的现代性。至少在拉班的欧洲语境下，现代性就是用机械运动取代人的运动。机器频繁地用作现代性来临的信号，而总是以人的缺失为代价。然而，中国的情况却很独特。因为是人塑造了它的现代性：机械从来都没能成为人的替代品。这在甘博的作品中就有例证。有轨电车确实是置换了人力，但人仍然填满了……

人从来没有被完完全全地从整个图景中分离出去；他总是找到新的途径把自己插入到“现代”这个概念中。冒昧地进一步说，甘博的作品也是一种机械化的行为——用相机捕捉人。但是它的角度，即谓视野本质上仍是属于人的。这个视角是属于甘博的。他又是另一个影响了人们如何看待现代中国图景的人。因此，人不仅是照片的社会语境与内容里不可或缺的一部分，而且是照片的创作中不可或缺的一部分。所以在此用一幅人手所创造，但最终还是机械再现的图像来作为结尾是十分合适的。在这张甘博所拍摄的照片中，同一个画面就整合了与相机捕捉人的运动和流动性有关的若干关键概念。看起来这是在火车上拍摄的照片，但它却呈现了另一种交通方式：船。它完美体现了独特的中国现代性的双重条件：人和机械化。火车让我们联想到撕裂自然风光的机器；而船上的人却让我们成为叙述的另一头。两者同时形成对比，但又以各自鲜明地结合在一起，创造出本文所定义的中国现代性。
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image Index</th>
<th>图像索引</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>感恩节，庆祝一战胜利太和殿大阅兵上的军队（1918年11月28日）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1919年6月3日，基督教青年会学生游行</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1919年6月3日，基督教青年会学生讲演，周围的警察</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>感恩节大阅兵，庆祝一战胜利大总统徐世昌太和殿讲演（1918年11月28日）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>庆祝一战胜利克林德碑被拆</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>公理战胜坊（原是克林德牌坊 1919年）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1919年6月28日学生们在棚子下合影</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1918年焚烧鸦片，鸦片稽查</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1918年焚烧鸦片，桌子上的鸦片烟</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>雍和宫，1919年3月1日，打鬼舞，戴面具的舞者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>泥泞的遂安伯胡同</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>普林斯顿大学中国中心——“北京普林斯顿”的院落，甘博与基督教青年会的干事们</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>孙中山葬礼，鲜花装饰的灵车</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>定县平民教育运动机构大门</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>定县女学生反日游行</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>圆明园遗迹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>马福（音译）和新娘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>查理和新娘</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>朝阳门（齐化门）教堂，老年妇女们</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>进香的妇女休息</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>葬礼上的女搬运者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>感恩节总统大阅兵，坐在香炉旁的老妇人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>感恩节总统大阅兵，满族妇女</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>感恩节总统大阅兵，满族妇女</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>粥场, 两个妇女</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>披斗篷的女孩</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>粮食配给，拄拐的老妪</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>美国卫理工会教堂外的妇女</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>抽烟的妇女</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>进香路两旁的乞丐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>进香的妇女</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>驱魔神舞，满族妇女</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>做矿工的男孩，吃东西</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>孔庙，满族妇女</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>煤矿上的童工拖煤出矿井</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>着老虎服的小孩</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>施粥，抽烟的男孩和其他孩子</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>粥场，两个男孩</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>掏粪的人</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>蒙古朝圣者</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>男人一手抽烟斗一手推婴儿车</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
42 举着两个鸟笼的男人  Birdcage Man
43 拄着两根拐棍的老人  Two Cane Man
44 街边剃头  Street Barber Shop
45 观火台  Fire Tower
46 佛塔和庄稼  Pagoda, Planting
47 晾晒猪膀胱  Pig Bladders
48 过新年，手拿玩具坐人力车  New Year, Rickshaws and Toys
49 买鸡蛋  Buying Eggs
50 做实验  Experiment
51 装大石  Loading Stone
52 苦力在凉棚下吃饭  Laborer Eating Under Awning
53 拉渔网  Pulling Fish Nets
54 猪市  Pig Market
55 徐世昌九弟徐世良葬礼，撒纸钱  Funeral of Ninth Brother of Hsu Shih Chang, Throwing Paper
56 农民扬场  Winnowing
57 读报  Reading
58 穿西装的男孩们  Western-Dressed Boys
59 婚礼，路边食物摊  Wedding, Roadside Restaurant
60 人群  Crowd Watching Picture Being Taken
61 发放粮食，签名处  Food Distribution, Signing Book
62 带枷的男子  Man with Kang
63 施粥  Congee Distribution
64 示众的人头  Head in Cage
65 背香者  Incense Carrier
66 老人和驴  Old Man and Donkey
67 装行李  Loading Baggage
68 骆驼和城门  Camel and Gateway
69 火车隧道和城墙  Railroad Tunnel and Wall
70 从火车上看到的船  Boat from Train
71 运河里的帆船  Canal Boat
72 第一辆有轨电车  First Street Car
73 前门上的钟表，1918年  Chienmen, Clocks
74 人力车  Rickshas
75 拉高粱秆的驴车  Wheel Barrow – Gaoliang Stalks
76 水车  Water Cart
77 驴车  Cart
78 骡轿  Mull Litter
79 舞台上的演出  Group on Stage
80 随葬的纸扎福特车和人  Funeral, Ford and Man
81 泼水养路  Sprinkler Wagon
82 用水泼街者  Sprinkling the Street
83 路边公厕  Toilet
84 老式监狱 站在门边的囚犯  Prison, Prisoner at Gate
85 老式监狱内部  Old Style Prison Interior
86 监狱，织布  Prison, Weaving Cloth
87 贫民救济院  Men in Poorhouse
88 监狱.犯人做衣服  Prison Tailor Shop
89 美国公理会办女子寄宿学校，中学教室
American Board Girls’ School, Middle School Classroom
90 语言学校的考试
Language School, Tests
91 监狱,犯人做火柴
Prison, Making Matches
92 四十八人拉辊
48 Men Pulling Roller
93 老式监狱，犯人放风
Prison, on Excise Ground
94 京师分监大门
Extension Prison Gate
95 监狱砖厂
Prison, Brick Yard
96 不良少年教养院, 做篮子
Poor Boys Prison, Making Baskets
97 盲人学校，模范讲堂
Blind School, Model Lecture Hall
98 华北协和女子学院，图书馆
North China Union Women’s College Library
99 半日制学校，模范讲堂
Half Day School, Model Lecture Hall
100 语言学校的考试
Language School, Tests
101 基督教青年会图书馆
YMCA Student Library
102 北京高等师范 发动机和样品车间
Peking Higher Normal, Shops Engine and Pattern Making
103 福利院的弃婴们
Babies in Foundlings Home
104 北京妇婴医院，慈善病房
Peking Women’s Hospital, Charity Ward
105 北京妇婴医院，手术室
Peking Women’s Hospital, Operating Room
106 北京妇婴医院，婴儿们
Peking Women’s Hospital, Babies
107 燕京大学建筑
Yenching Building
108 艾迪和晏阳初先生一家
Eddy and Yen Families
109 基督教青年会总部
YMCA Building
110 坐轿子的甘博
Gamble in Chair
111 西德尼·甘博
Sidney D. Gamble
112 童子军搭建木屋
Boy Scouts House
113 西德尼·甘博和平民教育运动的干事
Sidney Gamble and Mass Education Movement Secretary
114 甘博夫妇和埃丝特·穆迪
Sidney Gamble, Elizabeth Gamble and Esther Moody