This Exhibition Starts Here

Meene An
(MFA Arts and Humanities)

- This essay is a result of research originating from my personal contemplation on what exhibitions should be in the age of climate change.
- While you read this essay, if the words I've written wander through your mind, evoke particular questions or doubts, allow you to visualize several concrete scenes, and subtly alter your perception of the space you occupy, then whatever unfolds within that time and space, I wish to call it our 'exhibition.'
- I invite you to create the title of this exhibition. And as you read this text, I ask you to actively shape how our exhibition unfolds through your sensations and questions.
- Our exhibition briefly appears and then disappears as you are reading this essay.

HERE

The climate crisis is not merely an environmental disaster. It is an event that fundamentally questions the ways in which humans have constituted the world—namely, the structures of sensation, perception, and existence. Climate change cannot be grasped solely through quantifiable indicators such as increased greenhouse gas concentrations, rising average temperatures, or erosion of sea levels. Instead, it is a complex event that is sensorially invisible, cognitively obscured, and ontologically forces a redefinition of the relationship between ourselves and the world.

Timothy Morton's concept of "hyperobjects" clearly illustrates this structure of sensory incapacity. According to Morton, a hyperobject refers to an entity so vast and complex that it exceeds human perception or control. Objects such as the internet, capitalism, radiation, and plastic persist beyond human senses and temporality, deeply intertwined with human life through their immense scale, intricate structures, and systems, thus surpassing the boundaries of human sensory experience and knowledge. Similarly, climate change is always only partially understood; it is simultaneously sensed and not sensed, global and continuous, and characterized by complex causes that cannot be comprehensively understood or resolved in a short period.[1]

Meanwhile, T. J. Demos, in *Against the Anthropocene*, cautions against Timothy Morton's viewpoint. He points out that the climate crisis is not an issue stemming from human activity in general, but rather an event caused by specific historical and political structures—namely, exploitative systems constructed through the combination of colonialism and capitalism. He argues that the term "Capitalocene," introduced by Jason W. Moore, is a more appropriate expression than "Anthropocene."[2]

[1] Timothy Morton, *Hyperobjects: Philosophy and Ecology after the End of the World* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013).

[2] T. J. Demos, *Against the Anthropocene: Visual Culture and Environment Today* (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2017), 86. See also Jason W. Moore, "The Capitalocene, Part I: On the Nature and Origins of Our Ecological Crisis," *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 44, no. 3 (2017): 594–630, https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2016.1235036.

From this perspective, Timothy Morton's concept of the 'hyperobject' carries the risk of obscuring the political violence and structural inequalities inherent in the climate crisis. Demos emphasizes that rather than becoming overwhelmed by the magnitude of the climate crisis, we must actively reveal this violence. Furthermore, he suggests that the roots of the climate crisis should not be located in superficial responses such as individual ethical consumption or technological solutions but fundamentally in relationships characterized by structural exploitation and oppression.

I also believe that addressing the climate crisis should not simply involve technological or managerial solutions; rather, it must necessarily encompass a critical and sensory re-recognition of the historical and political violence embedded within the systems we inhabit. At the same time, the concepts of the "hyperobject" and the related idea of the "hypo-subject" introduced by Timothy Morton should not merely be dismissed as tools that depoliticize the climate crisis or induce helplessness. Instead, these concepts offer valuable perspectives, helping us humbly recalibrate individual subjectivity in the face of immense structural realities and activating a sensory imagination that moves beyond anthropocentric thinking. Through this approach, the climate crisis is not reduced merely to a problem to be managed or solved but rather opens up new avenues of thought for sensorially apprehending the weight of political and historical violence and power structures. In other words, while the concept of the hyperobject requires a critical caution, its fundamental potential—the capacity to extend human sensory and perceptual boundaries and thereby foster political imagination—should not be disregarded.

I believe that exhibitions in the era of climate crisis should constitute this non-human-centric political sensibility, functioning as spaces for questioning established modes of knowledge and perception and imagining alternative possibilities. Niklas Luhmann, in *Art as a Social System*, argues that art is not something given a priori but rather attains its autonomy within the social system through acts of

self-description.[3] Following Luhmann's perspective, I agree that art's self-description enables reflective awareness by maintaining a certain distance from the social system. However, I do not think that the essence of art simply coincides with the existence of the "artwork."

Rather, art is deeply intertwined with attitudes toward life. In other words, art fundamentally involves acts of engaging human senses and perceptions, visualizing and reconfiguring the relationship humans have with the world. Therefore, art always operates within the domains of sensation and perception, continuously opening possibilities for imaginative "deviation" within unpredictable contexts of life. In this sense, art can be seen as generating new possibilities by introducing unconscious ruptures within the otherwise closed structures of self-description. Thus, in this context, the crucial element is an imagination rooted in life itself.

Exhibition precisely embodies such an artistic attitude—not merely presenting artworks but concretely and practically actualizing this attitude within time and space. Therefore, rethinking exhibitions in an era that fundamentally questions our structures of sensation and perception—the era of climate crisis—goes beyond merely asking "What should we exhibit?" Instead, it fundamentally reconsiders exhibition forms and their operational modes, betraying conventional formats and imagining new possibilities through these ruptures.

Reflecting on exhibition as an active practice also compels us to reconsider the format through which these reflections themselves are communicated. As part of such practical endeavors, this text has been written as an experiment exploring the possibility of whether writing can substitute for an exhibition. However, judgments regarding the success or outcomes of this experiment remain highly personal and subjective. Thus, this experiment will never reach completion and will continuously circle back to its initial questions. As this text is shared and reshared among an indefinite audience, neither you nor I can predict where or how it will conclude. What you can do as you read—or rather, what I

[3] Niklas Luhmann, *Art as a Social System*, trans. Eva M. Knodt (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000), chap. 7 ("Self-Description").

hope you will do—is to question and doubt this text, imagining your own exhibition unfolding on the page.

I. ETHICAL, AESTHETIC, AND THUS POLITICAL

For our exhibition, I think it might also be interesting to examine the debate on participatory art between Grant Kester and Claire Bishop that took place in the early 2000s. This debate originates from Nicolas Bourriaud's *Relational Aesthetics* (1998).

In his theory of relational aesthetics, Bourriaud cites works by artists such as Rirkrit Tiravanija and Liam Gillick as examples, arguing that these artists transform passive viewers into active participants through open, experience-centered works that rely entirely on active audience participation. Bourriaud refers to this phenomenon as a "micro-utopia," explaining it as a shift away from grand utopian visions toward the creation of small-scale, temporary, and interactive spaces. Rather than aiming for permanent social change, these micro-utopias serve as provisional alternatives, offering models for a more humane and democratic coexistence within contemporary society.[4]

Meanwhile, Grant Kester, in *Conversation Pieces: Community and Communication in Modern Art* (2004), emphasizes the ethical dimension of participatory art, advocating artistic practices that facilitate empathy and communication among community members. He highlights projects such as Suzanne

[4] Nicolas Bourriaud, *Relational Aesthetics* (Dijon: Les Presses du réel, 1998), pp. 42–44, 46–48. Bourriaud describes Tiravanija's representative installation *Untitled (Free)* (1992), which transformed the exhibition space into a communal kitchen, allowing visitors to cook, share meals, and freely converse, thus creating temporary, inclusive social relations within the museum. Similarly, he explains how Gillick's *Discussion Platforms* activate gallery spaces as informal sites for gathering, discussion, and collaborative experiences.

Lacy's *Looftop*, noting their ethical and social significance in enabling local communities to directly engage in discussions of social issues and collaboratively seek solutions.[5]

However, the most compelling critique comes from Claire Bishop. In her essay "Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics" (2004), Bishop strongly critiques Nicolas Bourriaud's concept of the 'micro-utopia,' arguing that artistic participation should not necessarily aim for consensus or harmony.[6] Bishop's primary criticism is that Bourriaud's proposed micro-utopias overly optimistically disregard real social tensions and conflicts. Specifically, she extensively critiques Rirkrit Tiravanija's work praised by Bourriaud, suggesting that the intimacy and comfort it provides deal only superficially with social relationships. Bishop warns that this approach fails to reveal deeper conflicts and differences among participants, risking the concealment of tensions or the imposition of superficial empathy and consensus.[7]

To support her critique, Bishop references works such as Santiago Sierra's *250cm Line Tattooed on 6 Paid People*. In this provocative piece, Sierra pays participants to have lines tattooed onto their bodies, directly exposing the realities of exploitation and violence inherent in contemporary capitalist society. Bishop argues that such works accurately embody the desirable tension and conflict—namely, "antagonism"—that participatory art should strive to express.[8]

---

[5] Grant H. Kester, *Conversation Pieces: Community and Communication in Modern Art* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004). Suzanne Lacy invited approximately 220 Oakland high school students to an everyday space—a rooftop—to collectively address social issues such as gender, race, and class, and to collaboratively seek solutions. Additionally, around 1,000 spectators moved among parked vehicles to listen to these discussions, which were also broadcast in documentary form by local media and CNN, amplifying the students' perspectives to society.

[6] Claire Bishop, "Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics," October 110 (Fall 2004): 51–79; Jacques Rancière, The Politics of Aesthetics: The Distribution of the Sensible, trans. Gabriel Rockhill (London: Continuum, 2004).

[7] Ibid., 55.

[8] Ibid., 58.

Bishop's theoretical stance connects closely with Jacques Rancière's aesthetic theory. Rancière emphasizes that art embodies dissensus, the disruption of dominant social orders. From this viewpoint, Bishop criticizes Bourriaud's concept of micro-utopia for overly emphasizing harmony and consensus, thereby neglecting political tensions and conflicts. Instead, she argues, art gains genuine political significance and power when it actively reveals antagonisms and directly confronts the complexities of social relations.

However, Bishop's critique is itself challenged by Maria Lind. Lind argues that Bishop oversimplifies the complex and nuanced social contexts of participatory art, pointing out that conflict and harmony are not necessarily mutually exclusive but can coexist. She criticizes Bishop for underestimating the diverse social impacts that participatory art can generate.[9]

In summary, Nicolas Bourriaud focuses on the aesthetic potential of participatory art and the positive social interactions it fosters. Claire Bishop, in contrast, emphasizes the aesthetic tension and conflict as the genuine political value of participatory art. Grant Kester, meanwhile, prioritizes the ethical dimension, placing the greatest importance on fostering empathy and understanding among community members.

However, it is worth reconsidering whether these views are fundamentally opposed. Particularly, the ethical dimension emphasized by Grant Kester and the aesthetic (or political) tension highlighted by Claire Bishop represent different layers and emphases within participatory art, but they can be closely intertwined in actual artistic practice. For instance, participatory art aiming at empathy among community members does not necessarily exclude conflict, nor does it always result in unconditional consensus. Even when temporary consensus is reached, the exact outcomes or events that emerge among participants cannot be fully predicted. In other words, this form of participatory art can be aesthetically interpreted because, rather than simply representing conflicts,

[9] Maria Lind, "The Collaborative Turn," in Taking the Matter into Common Hands: On Contemporary Art and Collaborative Practices (London: Black Dog Publishing, 2007).

it reveals more complex underlying structures through participant dialogue. Conversely, artworks explicitly presenting tension and conflict to uncover concealed political realities can also lead participants to confront social issues and achieve deeper ethical reflection. Thus, viewers or participants might gain opportunities to newly recognize realities they previously overlooked or ignored, fostering empathy and understanding toward others.

At this point, revisiting Rancière's theory in greater detail is beneficial. Rancière introduces "dissensus" as a core concept in explaining the relationship between aesthetic experience and political action. According to him, dissensus is the fundamental principle of aesthetic politics, disrupting dominant sensory and social orders and enabling new perceptions and understandings. From Rancière's perspective, the ethical and aesthetic dimensions of participatory art are not mutually exclusive but rather complementary concepts capable of coexisting through tension and harmony.[10]

As Maria Lind has pointed out, the social effects and aesthetic tensions of participatory art cannot simply be divided into binary categories, as they are likely intertwined within various social contexts. Furthermore, it raises fundamental questions about what precisely constitutes ethical relations and aesthetic tension. Ethical relations might encompass more than simply moral or benevolent interactions; they could also involve an open attitude toward understanding and embracing the existence and experiences of others, as well as the multi-layered structures of the world. Likewise, aesthetic tension can be understood as more than merely exposing discomfort or conflict; it could involve participants and viewers actively interpreting complex realities, uncovering hidden meanings, and reconstructing them. Ultimately, ethics and aesthetics in participatory art do not exist independently but continually evolve and redefine themselves through their interaction.

[10] Eun Young Jin, On the Aesthetic Politics of Kim Su Young's Literature: Aesthetics of Disagreement and Politics of Trans-border (한국문학연구학회 [The Society of Korean Literary Studies], 2010), 501–504.

Moreover, it is interesting to consider what elements we might focus on when evaluating aesthetic judgments in the particular environment of "participatory art," where relationships are temporarily formed and then dissolve. While "beauty" in visual artworks typically adheres to certain frameworks, contemporary art has already embraced concepts such as "ugliness," "strangeness," "emptiness," or "simplicity" within its aesthetic domain. Additionally, through various discussions acknowledging beauty as relative, social, cultural, or institutional, it seems we have tacitly agreed to place the definition of "beauty" into a metaphorical drawer and accept our differences. But perhaps it is worth reopening that drawer to reconsider aesthetic practices of exhibitions in the age of climate crisis.

In fact, the reason for extensively discussing the debate among Bourriaud, Bishop, and Kester is due to the distinctive nature of "participatory art." Contemporary participatory art has undergone a complex developmental process characterized by multiple contexts and layers, thus embodying both ethical and aesthetic qualities. Moreover, given its dual nature as both exhibition and artwork, participatory art offers many relevant aspects for our consideration.

Participatory art can trace significant roots back to the happenings and performance art of the 1960s. Happenings involved the spontaneous and active participation of audiences beyond the artist's predetermined plans or scripts. Allan Kaprow, through happenings, dismantled boundaries between artist and audience, and between artwork and daily life, redefining art as an experience-centered and dynamic event. Following in the tradition of happenings and performances, participatory art evolved to require physical and emotional engagement from viewers, emphasizing the artistic experience itself as the core artwork.

Another significant trend in participatory art originates from a reflective and critical context within public art. Initially, public art emerged as a form aimed at improving urban aesthetics or delivering specific social messages. However, since the 1980s, critical and reflective approaches towards this art form have emerged. In this process, artists have

expanded beyond merely placing artworks in public spaces, actively collaborating and communicating with communities to address social issues. Artists like Suzanne Lacy, Mierle Laderman Ukeles, and Rick Lowe have extended artistic practice by engaging in long-term cooperation and dialogue with communities to explore social and political issues.

These two trends—participatory art stemming from happenings and performance art, and that originating from critical public art—both constitute important branches in the history of participatory art, yet they exhibit subtle differences in approach and emphasized values. The trend originating from happenings emphasizes the aesthetic potential of artistic experience itself and the physical and sensory participation of audiences. In contrast, the trend emerging from public art places greater importance on ethical responsibility, social dialogue, and continuous, reflective cooperation with communities. Nevertheless, contemporary participatory art has evolved into a more complex and multilayered form, influenced and enriched by interactions between these trends rather than clearly separated by them.

I pay particular attention to these characteristics of participatory art: its format that emerges from self-reflection on art forms, and its complex outcomes that encompass ethical, aesthetic, and thus political dimensions. Moving toward openness and breaking down boundaries, collaborating and communicating with communities—these aspects define both the ethical and aesthetic features of participatory art. Such ethical and aesthetic characteristics of participatory art can offer new sensory and political possibilities under the contemporary condition of the climate crisis.

Considering this perspective in relation to exhibition formats in the age of climate crisis, we can explore how to create exhibition forms that are simultaneously ethical and aesthetic. This inquiry transcends the mere conveyance of ethically correct messages or the intensity of aesthetic experiences, focusing instead on the delicate construction of encounters capable of forming new relationships between humans and non-humans, communities and environments, subjects and others. Furthermore, such exhibition formats

necessitate continuous reflection on their conditions and limitations, maintaining a critical and revising attitude toward their own forms.

In this context, I suggest that an attitude of openness—moving away from anthropocentric and development-centered thinking—can be ethically aligned with humility and simplicity. This attitude can also be considered from an aesthetic viewpoint.[11]. Thus, I propose examining exhibitions that adopt these virtues as ethical practices and aesthetic conditions. In other words, exhibitions can choose fluidity and openness rather than enforcing clear and fixed formats, thereby suggesting intimacy and humility in relationships as both aesthetic and ethical qualities. Recognizing complex relationships between humans and non-humans, maintaining humility toward these relationships, and accepting uncertainty constitute ethical, aesthetic, and ultimately political practices suitable for the climate crisis era.

II. THE SMALLER IT BECOMES, THE MORE IT VANISHES, IMAGINATION FILLS THE GAP

Now, I want to talk about "size" and "scale." Recent critical discussions emerging alongside the climate crisis also emphasize these aspects. This importance is not merely due to the environmental benefits of reducing size, but because "size" and "speed" are deeply rooted values embedded within our capitalist mindset. Imagining possibilities beyond this worldview inevitably requires reconsideration of size and speed. We constantly desire bigger, more abundant, and faster things, and art is not exempt from this desire. I do not intend to dismiss this desire entirely, as there are clearly advantages associated with larger scales.

Dave Beech, in his lecture The Scale of Contemporary Art, suggests that scaling-up does not merely involve increasing the size of art institutions but fundamentally alters their

[11] When discussing Korean aesthetics, humility and simplicity indeed emerge as important elements of beauty. See Ko Yu-seop, *Profound Simplicity: Korean Aesthetics*, edited by Jin Hong-seop (Seoul: Dahal Media, 2011).

internal logic and character.[12] In other words, he points out the possibility that, as institutions grow larger, they may shift from their original critical and experimental roles toward structures emphasizing economic efficiency and commercial outcomes.[13]

This critique similarly applies to art museums' relationships with the environment. Alongside the environmental costs incurred by physical expansion, the continuous pursuit of larger scale and increased speed inevitably ties into capitalist values that accelerate environmental crises. Thus, the issue of size and speed in museums necessitates fundamental reconsideration, not only environmentally but also institutionally, culturally, and politically.

However, the advantages offered by larger scale institutions cannot be ignored. Large museums have the capacity for diversity, inclusivity, and accessibility that smaller institutions often lack, and their extensive resources enable potential communication with broader audiences. Therefore, simply reducing size is not the sole solution.

The crucial point is that art institutions should not unconditionally pursue size and speed. Instead, they must clearly recognize the benefits and drawbacks of such growth, maintaining critical reflection and a balanced approach. Ultimately, our goal should not be mere expansion but rather responsible and critical management of scale.[14]

Meanwhile, Cissie Fu introduces an alternative perspective on scale and size. In her work *Unfix, Unform, Unlearn*, Fu departs from conventional concepts of size and scale, emphasizing uncertainty and openness. She proposes that art and museums should not remain confined by fixed structures or predefined scales, but rather freely explore new possibilities. Fu argues that stepping away from rigid formats, leaving

[12] Dave Beech, "The Scale of Contemporary Art: From Artwork to Exhibition to Institution and Beyond," in *Size Matters! (De)Growth of the 21st Century Art Museum*, ed. Beatrix Ruf, John Slyce, and Dorothee Richter (Zurich: JRP Ringier, 2018), 204.

[13] Ibid., 198–199.

[14] Ibid., 204–205.

images open-ended, and occasionally dismantling existing knowledge and judgments enable more creative and innovative approaches.[2] Such an approach can be viewed as shifting discussions about scale from a purely quantitative and physical dimension to more flexible and critical modes of thinking.[15]

Let's approach this from another angle. In *Making the Maximum of the Minimum: A Close Reading of Nasreen Mohamedi*, Kreuger employs Emily Dickinson's poetry as a kind of intellectual foundation to carefully interpret the drawings of Indian artist Nasreen Mohamedi (1937–1990). For Kreuger, Dickinson's poems provide a linguistic resonance structure supporting the frameworks of sensation, temporality, and self-isolation crucial for comprehending Mohamedi's work. Both artists' practices notably exhibit a sensory condensation; Kreuger particularly emphasizes that Mohamedi's drawings are "drawn rather than produced," with each line intentionally placed to fulfill a definite and meaningful purpose.[16] In other words, Mohamedi's attitude of "making the maximum out of the minimum" rejects external criteria defining size or form, instead following an internal rhythm, personal judgment, and the structure of sensory decision-making. This constitutes both the ethical foundation and the distinctive aesthetics of her work. Here, 'smallness' or 'immateriality' is not a deficiency but a potentiality, inviting a disruption of conventional sensory structures and encouraging contemplation of life's rhythms and invisible frameworks.

Kreuger's text offers us a crucial insight: the idea that an intrinsic reason that "must necessarily be so" can create both ethical and aesthetic value. Such a reason may sometimes fail to convince others and might even conflict with socially accepted values. However, if art's purpose lies in critical reflection and imagining free possibilities, then rigorously

---

[15] Cissie Fu, "Unfix, Unform, Unlearn," in *Size Matters! (De)Growth of the 21st Century Art Museum*, ed. Beatrix Ruf, John Slyce, and Dorothee Richter (Zurich: JRP Ringier, 2018), 140–141.

[16] Anders Kreuger, "Making the Maximum of the Minimum: A Close Reading of Nasreen Mohamedi," *Afterall* 21 (2009): 37, 41.

contemplating and envisioning these necessary reasons becomes both an ontological ethics and a unique aesthetic condition of the artwork. The same applies to exhibitions. It is essential to question whether impressive appearances and grand scales merely reflect personal desires or social demands, or whether they stem from intrinsic reasons necessary to generate the exhibition's unique value and aesthetic qualities. Since this critical reflection is something only the creator can—and indeed must—undertake, the curator's judgment and practice in shaping exhibition formats inevitably occupy an ethical, aesthetic, and thus political position.

Let's examine another interesting paper on scale. Paul Emmons, in his essay "Size Matters: Virtual Scale and Bodily Imagination in Architectural Drawing" (2005), reconsiders scale not merely as a technical element but as a structure of architectural imagination and perception. In particular, he critically analyzes how the illusion of "full scale" in the digital era (CAD) imposes certain limitations on architectural thinking.[17]

Beginning with Borges's famous allegory of the map, this essay critically illustrates the paradox where a life-sized map becomes useless, highlighting that designing at "full scale" within CAD environments, despite initially appearing complete and precise, ultimately results in the loss of scale's fundamental significance. Emmons regards scale not merely as an issue of proportion or measurement, but as a cognitive tool that utilizes human bodily senses and imagination to construct architectural worlds.[18]

Scale has traditionally served as a method for interpreting and imagining the world based on bodily units, with classical drawings functioning as miniature bodies themselves, enabling one to metaphorically "walk and inhabit" the spaces within the drawing. Emmons refers to this as "imaginative

[17] Paul Emmons, "Size Matters: Virtual Scale and Bodily Imagination in Architectural Drawing," *Architectural Research Quarterly* 9, no. 3–4 (2005).

[18] Ibid., 227–228.

inhabitation."[19] For example, classical architects created imaginative frameworks that allowed them to bodily experience and inhabit the drawn spaces, either by placing small human figures on their drawings or by using dividers to metaphorically "walk" across the paper, thus enabling architects to physically sense the spatial dimensions within the drawings themselves.

The relationship between scale and imagination also emerges as an important symbolic structure in Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels*. As Gulliver is depicted as a twelve-fold giant in Lilliput and subsequently a twelve-fold dwarf in Brobdingnag, he constantly adjusts and deconstructs the scale of the world he inhabits. Crucially, he always needs to reimagine the world based on his own bodily scale. Gulliver physically lays a map of the kingdom on the ground, walking barefoot upon it to measure the cities. This scene vividly recalls Emmons's concept of "imaginative inhabitation," highlighting that scale should not merely be perceived as distance or numerical value, but rather as the foundation of spatial sensation, rhythm, and linear imagination.

CAD systems eliminate this sensory grounding, reducing the designer from a figure who experiences spatial proportions bodily to a mere numerical observer. In CAD, designers endlessly zoom in and out using a mouse, yet they fail to genuinely imagine how that space relates physically to their own bodies. Emmons identifies this condition as designing within the "absence of scale," or what he calls the illusion of "non-scale." He warns that this approach ultimately disrupts imagination and numbs spatial perception in the design process.

Ultimately, Emmons emphasizes the necessity of restoring our ability to "imagine through scale" within contemporary design practices. Only when we can again become the "small body" walking within the drawing can architecture transcend mere measurement techniques to function as a practice of imagination.

[19] Ibid., 232.

Our experience is not solely cognitive. We do not simply understand space—we live it by feeling, sensing, and imagining. Such imagination is not merely supplementary; it represents the most fundamental mode through which we form relationships with the world and construct spatial environments.

For instance, *Dream Journey to the Peach Blossom Land* (Mongyu Dowondo) by An Gyeon, created in 1447 during the Joseon Dynasty, was commissioned by Prince Anpyeong based on the Peach Blossom Land he had dreamt of. This landscape painting is structured to guide the viewer's gaze from the lower left toward the upper right. Following this visual path allows the viewer to imagine themselves walking along the depicted route and experiencing the scenery firsthand. The depiction of small figures traversing mountains and rivers invites viewers to imaginatively enter the pictorial space. This compositional strategy can be understood as a structural device that generates a dynamic sensory experience within a static image.[20]

What matters here is not the physical size of the painting or the figures within it. Whether the figures are small or the depicted spaces are reduced, their effectiveness arises precisely because they stimulate our imagination, provoking sensations of "movement" and "inhabitation." Thus, the critical question is not about size itself, but rather about how the imaginative relationship between space and viewer is opened and sustained.

Similarly, in architectural or digital drawings, the key is not whether they are full-scale or reduced-scale but whether the drawings enable observers to imaginatively shrink or enlarge their own bodies, thus allowing them to sensorially inhabit the depicted space. A full-scale environment devoid of imaginative engagement can render us numb, whereas smaller-scale drawings might enhance sensory density and immersive experience.

Ultimately, scale is not primarily a question of physical size but a condition for activating imagination. It is less about dimensions and more about the sensory relationships it

[20] Hwi-jun Ahn, *An Gyeon and Mongyu Dowondo* (revised new edition, Seoul: Sahoi Pyungnon, 2009), Chapter VII.

fosters. Whether we can genuinely inhabit a space or merely gaze upon it is determined not by its size but by imagination itself.

III. CURATOR, CURATING, CURATORIAL AS '-BECOMING'

Interestingly, the more curators attempt to define 'curator,' 'curating,' and 'curatorial,' the further these terms move away from any fixed meaning or role. Indeed, I argue that such 'unfixedness' should constitute their very essence.

The term 'curator' originally derives from the Latin word *cura*, meaning 'to care,' and from the eighteenth century onward, it referred to those responsible for managing collections. However, contemporary curators such as Charles Esche highlight that this historical definition no longer aligns with the diverse roles modern curators undertake, suggesting instead the need for a new, more suitable terminology.[21] The role of the contemporary curator has expanded and diversified to such an extent that it is now frequently described using various metaphors, such as "curator as editor," "curator as anthropologist," "curator as stylist," and "curator as DJ." Thus, the curator is seen as fulfilling simultaneous and multidimensional roles rather than embodying a single identity.

Tom Morton, however, critically examines this formulation of "curator as...," warning that such descriptors risk reducing or confusing the curator's role, portraying it as a limited or secondary task. Morton emphasizes that curating encompasses a broader range of responsibilities, not merely the creation of exhibitions but also the reinterpretation and transformation of objects, images, and histories. Citing Vladimir Nabokov's novel *The Visit to the Museum*, Morton suggests that curators possess a broader cultural significance —they exist both through presence and absence, carrying and

[21] Beti Zerovc, "Interviews Charles Esche," in When Attitudes Become the Norm: The Contemporary Curator and Institutional Art (Berlin: Archive Books, 2016), 148–165.

transforming cultural memory beyond merely managing exhibitions.[22]

Just as the term "curator" is characterized by uncertainty in its scope, the definitions of "curating" and "curatorial" are equally unfixed, with curators presenting diverse perspectives. For instance, curator Maria Lind defines "curating" narrowly as the technical and practical conditions involved in exhibition-making, while she understands "curatorial" as a broader concept encompassing all research activities and imaginative processes preceding exhibition production.[23] This view aligns closely with the perspectives of Irit Rogoff and Beatrice von Bismarck, who emphasize that while "curating" denotes restricted activities conditioned by systemic constraints, "the curatorial" represents a broader, holistic mode of thinking that freely imagines possibilities for change.[24]

On the other hand, Taiwanese curator Hongjohn Lin critiques the tendency to excessively differentiate or idealize the concepts of "curating" and "the curatorial," referencing Harald Szeemann's description of a curator as merely an "exhibition-maker (Ausstellungsmacher)." Lin argues that the practical act of curating inherently contains a creative and poetic dimension, and thus sees no need to overly abstract the idea of the curatorial. Nonetheless, he simultaneously explores the concept of the curatorial in a broader context. Lin views the curatorial as a complex concept that goes beyond mere exhibition research or preliminary thinking, emphasizing philosophical and ethical approaches. Particularly highlighting "knowledge production" as central to curatorial activity, Lin notes that since knowledge is always produced within specific political and social structures, curatorial

---

[22] Tom Morton, "The Name of the Game," *frieze* 97 (2006), accessed June 8, 2025, https://www.frieze.com/article/name-game.

[23] Maria Lind, "Situating the Curatorial," *e-flux journal* 116 (2021), accessed June 8, 2025, https://www.e-flux.com/journal/116/378689/situating-the-curatorial/.

[24] Irit Rogoff and Beatrice von Bismarck, "Curating/Curatorial," in *Cultures of the Curatorial*, ed. Beatrice von Bismarck, Jörn Schafaff, and Thomas Weski (London: Sternberg Press, 2012), 23–24.

practice must critically reflect on these structures, offering audiences new epistemological possibilities.[25]

Further, Hongjohn Lin discusses the political dimension of the curatorial by drawing upon Chantal Mouffe's concept of "the political." According to Lin, curatorial practice should create a space capable of transforming audience perception through aesthetic and political "antagonism." Here, the political does not necessarily imply direct political action in social reality; rather, it should manifest uniquely within the exhibition context through distinct aesthetic experiences. Lin emphasizes that curatorial practice should not merely deliver political messages but instead foster the audience's aesthetic and epistemological autonomy.

Additionally, Lin connects the essential attitude of curatorial practice to the concept of "care." Citing Heidegger's ontological notion of Sorge (care) and the Roman mythological figure Cura, he underscores that curatorial practice extends beyond the mere management or selection of artworks to possess an ontological and ethical dimension. He concludes that the curatorial must reflectively engage with the connections among audiences, artworks, and society, facilitating a reconfiguration of self-awareness and social relations through aesthetic experiences.[26]

I generally agree with Hongjohn Lin's perspective. However, what particularly intrigues me in these discussions is the trajectory of *cura*—the etymological root of "curator," "curating," and "curatorial." When cura is discussed strictly in relation to the curator's central activities, its meaning tends to become diffuse due to the broadness and complexity involved. Conversely, when the discussion focuses on relationships around curators or their fundamental attitudes, the concept of cura closely reattaches itself to the very idea of the curator. The attempt to distinguish between "curating" and "curatorial" perhaps arises from a perceived gap in attitude between these two forms of practice. While

[25] Hongjohn Lin, "The Curatorial Thing," *Curatography* 5 (2020), accessed June 8, 2025, https://curatography.org/5-2-en/.

[26] Ibid.

"curating" adjusts itself to institutional frameworks, existing within accepted environments, the "curatorial" critically examines and reflects upon those same conditions from multiple perspectives. Naturally, the curator inherently embodies the conflicts and tensions between these two poles. Thus, perhaps Lin's position—that curatorial practice must "offer audiences new epistemological possibilities"—might appear overly idealistic if one does not adequately acknowledge or grapple with the tensions existing between "curating" and the “curatorial."

I believe that this conflict and tension inevitably give rise to the inherent uncertainty of the curatorial. Such uncertainty suggests that the curator's role and practices cannot simply be delineated conceptually or confined within fixed definitions. Instead, the curatorial might ultimately be understood as an ongoing exploratory process, one that continuously navigates ambiguity, tension, and conflict to find its meaning.

At this juncture, it is worthwhile to briefly consider Deleuze’s concept of "becoming." In Deleuze’s philosophy, becoming is never merely a straightforward transition from one form to another. Rather, it is fundamentally a movement that continually dismantles identities, persistently shifting toward new modes of existence.[27] What matters here is not a teleological transformation toward a fixed form or identity, but rather an indeterminate, open-ended process of continual change—one that dissolves boundaries of identity and continuously redefines itself through relationships with the other.[28]

Through the philosophy of "becoming," the curator must transcend fixed roles or identities, continually engaging in practices of transformation. In the process of curating and constructing exhibitions, curators constantly interact with diverse contexts, reshaping their identities and roles. This indicates that curators should not adhere to any particular essence or fixed identity but rather remain flexible,

---

[27] Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, trans. Brian Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987), 238.

[28] Ibid., 239.

embracing a variety of possibilities. Thus, the essence of a curator may indeed be an absence of essence. The ethical dimension of the curator, therefore, lies precisely in accepting this state of "essencelessness" and maintaining an attitude of openness.

However, this uncertainty and openness of the curatorial extend beyond mere ethics. I propose that the aesthetics of the curatorial are not manifested solely within individual exhibitions, but rather emerge through a process in which curators continuously evolve, critically reflecting upon and adjusting their practices over the course of multiple exhibitions. That is, curatorial aesthetics should not be seen as temporary or fragmented expressions, but rather as revealed through ongoing transformations and reconstructions within varied temporal contexts. Ultimately, the curatorial must be understood as a process of continual self-deconstruction and reconfiguration, one that generates new aesthetic possibilities and experiences.

IV. WHAT, THEN, SHOULD AN EXHIBITION BE IN THE AGE OF CLIMATE CRISIS?

The art world's attention to climate change has been steadily growing since the 1990s, but it was from the 2010s onward that it began to be addressed extensively and consistently as a global exhibition theme.[29] If we consider exhibitions related to global warming and the Anthropocene, there are undoubtedly countless exhibitions taking place globally each year. Especially since the 2010s, exhibitions have evolved beyond merely diagnosing climate change or informing audiences of its importance; instead, they actively explore underlying social and political issues, aiming to dismantle anthropocentrism and investigate new sensory and ontological paradigms. Furthermore, research continues on practical actions museums and galleries can take, alongside the emergence of various organizations and collaborative

[29] Edited by Jennifer Newell, Libby Robin, and Kirsten Wehner, *Curating the Future: Museums, Communities and Climate Change* includes contributions from approximately 37 authors, offering diverse perspectives on the transformations, practices, responsibilities, and ethics of museums in relation to climate change.

initiatives among art institutions seeking to collectively respond to climate change.[30]

Major international art events such as biennials have also demonstrated significant interest in artists addressing climate change from diverse perspectives. For instance, at the 2013 Venice Biennale, the Maldives Pavilion presented Thierry Geoffroy's format art project, *Emergency Room*, employing tent installations and performances to politically communicate the real threat of flooding in the Maldives. Similarly, at the 2019 Venice Biennale, the Lithuanian Pavilion won the Golden Lion award for the operatic performance *Sun & Sea (Marina)*, which subtly infiltrated familiar scenes of a beach with songs reflecting the climate crisis.

What is particularly notable about these exhibitions and biennials is their active engagement with philosophers and scientists who provide theoretical foundations regarding the urgency of climate crises and calls for change. Bruno Latour, who critiques the artificial separation of human and non-human, politics and ecology in works such as *We Have Never Been Modern* (1991) and *Down to Earth* (2017), co-curated the exhibition *Critical Zones* (2020) at ZKM in Germany. Through the concept of a "Thought Exhibition," he transformed the exhibition space into a place for recognizing and experiencing the climate crisis. Furthermore, as co-curator of the 2020 Taipei Biennial, titled "You and I Don't Live on the Same Planet," Latour organized the exhibition space as a planetary experience, metaphorically visualizing how the Earth we inhabit is experienced as multiple different "planets."

[30] Numerous institutions dedicated to researching and advocating climate action have emerged, and museums themselves have actively begun to conduct research and develop programs aimed at achieving practical results. Examples such as the National Museum of Modern and Contemporary Art, Korea's exhibition *Museum-Carbon-Project* (2022), which measured and reflected on the museum's own carbon emissions, and the Nam June Paik Art Center's exhibition *Ecological Sense* (2019), illustrate how art institutions are formally adapting to changes. Additionally, organizations fostering collective action among galleries and artists continue to proliferate, hosting practical projects and seminars.
See Rachel Kubrick, "What Is the Art World Doing About Climate Change?" *Ocula*, June 16, 2023, https://ocula.com/magazine/art-news/what-is-the-art-world-doing-about-climate-change/; and Gallery Climate Coalition, accessed May 25, 2025, https://galleryclimatecoalition.org/.

Additionally, experts such as Donna Haraway and Timothy Morton have frequently participated as panelists in various talks and seminars associated with exhibitions.[31] Though not directly focused on the climate crisis, philosophers associated with Object-Oriented Ontology (OOO)—a philosophical movement emphasizing new ontologies beyond anthropocentrism—such as Graham Harman and Yuk Hui, have frequently participated as seminar panelists and contributed essays to various art-related platforms.[32] Such interdisciplinary exchanges have been made possible largely because philosophers, science and technology scholars, and media theorists like Graham Harman, Bruno Latour, Donna Haraway, and Yuk Hui have themselves shown active interest in art, contributing texts directly related to artistic practice. These thinkers recognize art as having its own distinctive operational mode, capable of revealing and prompting reconsideration of issues that philosophy, science, and technology alone cannot fully address. Thus, they view art as an "experimental field" where concepts and sensations,

---

[31] Donna Haraway, in her book *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucene* (2016), proposes a radical approach of "staying with the trouble," encouraging imaginative new ecological relationships through practices of kin-making between human and non-human beings. Haraway's ideas have inspired ecological installations by artists such as Hortense Spillers and Katharina Grosse, demonstrating her close collaboration with the art world, further acknowledged by her Lifetime Achievement Award at the 2025 Venice Architecture Biennale.
Timothy Morton, in *Hyperobjects: Philosophy and Ecology after the End of the World* (2013), introduces the concept of "hyperobjects"—entities such as climate change, plastic, and nuclear radiation that humans can never fully perceive through their senses. This concept has been widely adopted within the art world, and Morton himself has been invited as a speaker at various institutions, including the Kemper Art Museum at Washington University, engaging actively with artists. Morton's philosophy encourages exhibitions not merely to "show" the climate crisis but to challenge perceptual boundaries and subvert established sensory experiences.

[32] Object-Oriented Ontology (OOO) actively addresses non-human objects and the human position and relationships within these contexts, themes previously explored by artists influenced by Deleuze's concept of "becoming." Given its alignment with concerns about overcoming anthropocentrism and the climate crisis, it is not surprising that OOO has attracted considerable interest within the art world, often serving as a theoretical foundation for works by artists aiming to transcend human-centered perspectives.
See Dylan Kerr, "What Is Object-Oriented Ontology? A Quick-and-Dirty Guide to the Philosophical Movement Sweeping the Art World," *Artspace*, April 8, 2016, https://www.artspace.com/magazine/interviews_features/a-guide-to-object-oriented-ontology-art.

materials and thoughts intertwine and dynamically interact.[33]

These interdisciplinary exchanges are positively valued for broadening perspectives. However, whether such interactions genuinely foster critical shifts in sensibility within exhibition spaces remains an open question. Many artists do indeed experiment with expanded viewpoints derived from multidisciplinary dialogue, using their work to propose new sensory and intellectual horizons. For instance, Olafur Eliasson collaborates closely with environmental scientists and geographers to bring tangible, sensory experiences of glacial melting directly into exhibition spaces, prompting visitors to vividly engage with the reality of climate crisis. Similarly, the group Superflex interacts with economists, anthropologists, and other scholars to visually link issues like rising sea levels to their broader social contexts, actively urging visitors toward practical responses. These examples suggest the potential of interdisciplinary exchanges to extend beyond gallery walls, stimulating substantial shifts in the viewer's critical sensibility and imagination.

However, one might ask why interdisciplinary exchange often fails to fundamentally alter exhibition practices. Does inviting experts from other fields into galleries, hosting their lectures or seminars, and showcasing their experiments genuinely expand the scope of exhibitions or incite meaningful critical transformations? Contrastingly, the 7th Berlin Biennale in 2012, curated by Polish artist Artur Żmijewski, provides a compelling example of expanding the sensory horizon of exhibitions. Żmijewski transformed the art space into an active site of political protest.[34] Kate Fowle, in "The Aesthetic Failure of the Occupy Movement," notes that while Artur Żmijewski's attempt initially received negative feedback due to aesthetic confusion and ambiguous messaging, this very failure might have been an intentional one—aimed at exploring possibilities beyond traditional boundaries of art and political resistance. Nonetheless, Fowle evaluates this

[33] Bruno Latour, interview excerpt in *Bifrost Online*, "What are the optimal interrelations of art, science and politics in the Anthropocene?," November 30, 2017.

[34] "22nd Berlin Biennale – Forget Fear," *Berlin Biennale Official Website*, accessed June 8, 2025, https://www.berlinbiennale.de/en/biennalen/22/forget-fear.

case as an important example demonstrating art's potential to engage directly with real social issues and evolve into more tangible and concrete artistic practices aimed at addressing community, environmental, and economic problems.[35]

Żmijewski's decision to transform the art museum into a protest site and to invite young activists and marginalized artists instead of established figures went beyond merely urging art to fulfill social roles—it genuinely unsettled the art critical establishment. As Kate Farrington pointed out, Żmijewski reconceived the biennale's curatorial framework and exhibition spaces as sites of performance and event, deliberately exposing and dismantling the hidden political boundaries within them. This act challenged traditional aesthetic and political perceptions, thereby necessitating its interpretation as an aesthetic practice in itself.

Here it is instructive to briefly consider the example of 1960s conceptual art. Benjamin Buchloh, in *Conceptual Art 1962-1969: From the Aesthetic of Administration to the Critique of Institutions*, historically analyzes conceptual art from 1962 to 1969, characterizing it as a fundamental critique of art's modes of production, distribution, and reception—transforming art from a primarily visual and sensory experience into one of linguistic and institutional analysis. According to Buchloh, conceptual art explicitly revealed the process by which the artwork ceased to be merely an aesthetic object, becoming instead a linguistic proposition, embedded within institutional contexts and administrative formats.[36]

Around the same period, Guy Debord, in *The Society of the Spectacle* (1967), critically examined the visual culture and power structures of capitalist society, arguing that life replaced by images alienates human experiences and

[35] Kate Farrington, "The Failure of Aesthetics in the Occupy Movement Seen through the Lens of the 7th Berlin Biennale," *Artcore Journal*, January 23, 2013, accessed June 8, 2025, http://artcorejournal.net/2013/01/23/the-failure-of-aesthetics-in-the-occupy-movement-seen-through-the-lens-of-the-7th-berlin-biennale-by-kate-farrington/.

[36] Benjamin H. D. Buchloh, "Conceptual Art 1962–1969: From the Aesthetic of Administration to the Critique of Institutions," *October* 55 (Winter 1990): 105–143.

perceptions. As a member of the Situationist International, Debord exposed how capitalist society controls culture, mass media, and imagery, reducing humans to passive consumers through representations.

In other words, the artistic turn by conceptual artists at that time aimed not merely at critiquing art institutions, but also involved a complex critical analysis of social institutions more broadly, as well as reflective considerations on the language and institutional self-description of art itself.

Viewed in this context, the practices of conceptual artists extended beyond internal artistic self-reflection through self-description. They encompassed a critical stance, questioning how the art system itself is constituted and sustained through interactions with external social and political structures. Conceptual art thus dismantled traditional aesthetic experiences and transformed art into an institutional discourse, defining it explicitly as a system operating within specific social, political, and economic conditions.

As Buchloh points out, the core contribution of conceptual art lies in reframing the artwork not merely as an aesthetic object, but rather as a linguistic proposition, administrative procedure, and relational product within institutional spaces such as museums and galleries. This directly resonates with Guy Debord's critique of the image and spectacle, highlighting how visual culture aligns with capitalist structures to alienate human subjectivity. Conceptual artists' practices shifted the focus of artworks from transcendent aesthetic objects isolated from social relations toward tools that explicitly reveal and critically analyze those very social relationships.

In particular, conceptual artists such as Sol LeWitt, Joseph Kosuth, Hans Haacke, Martha Rosler, Mary Kelly, Adrian Piper, and Agnes Denes visualized power structures within institutional spaces, emphasizing the intricate connections between art and the processes of producing and distributing knowledge, information, and power. This went beyond mere internal artistic self-reflection; it revealed how art's

institutional self-description inherently overlaps with broader social self-descriptions and systemic structures.

Ultimately, conceptual art of the late 1960s, viewed through Luhmann's concept of "self-description," can be understood as a complex practice that simultaneously engaged with self-reflection and social critique. Through this dual process, art not only redefined its own methodology of self-description but also fundamentally reconfigured its relationship with broader social contexts, thereby expanding the potential scope and possibilities of artistic self-description.

Lucy Lippard once noted that the experimental exhibition history of conceptual art has been deliberately obscured.[37] Nevertheless, today we recognize, drawing upon conceptual art's legacy, that art holds greater possibilities than ever before, without restricting its categories or forms. In other words, the self-reflective and socially critical nature demonstrated by conceptual art is no longer unfamiliar or exceptional to us; rather, it has become naturally integrated into our contemporary practices, consistently expanding the boundaries of art through active interdisciplinary engagement. In this respect, conceptual art was a significant event with considerable influence on both our perception and the history of art.

Then, what should an exhibition that reflects the age of climate crisis look like? If the climate crisis demands a fundamental epistemological shift, what form might a reflective exhibition that embodies this shift take?

V. EXHIBITION AS EXPERIENCE

How do these seemingly scattered discussions—ethics, aesthetics, politics, scale, curator, curating, curatorial, interdisciplinary exchange, experimental exhibition forms, institutional critique, self-reflection—relate to exhibitions in the age of climate crisis? To me, too, exhibitions are

[37] Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution. (2011, March 15). *Oral history interview with Lucy R. Lippard / conducted by Sue Heinemann*. Found at https://www.aaa.si.edu/collections/interviews/oral-history-interview-lucy-lippard-15936 (accessed 8 June 2025)

experimental fields—not merely as a curator, but as an individual. Art, in my view, does not exist as a formal aesthetic object outside of life; rather, it is an activity that constitutes and transforms the structure of life itself. Exhibitions unfold this activity, creating a space where I can step back from myself and await unexpected encounters with the other.

John Dewey, in *Art as Experience* (1934), defines art as a highly "condensed experience," a concentrated moment of life itself.[38] Here, although Dewey still refers to art primarily as "artwork," he emphasizes the experiences that emerge through encountering meaningful moments within the flow of life mediated by artworks, rather than the artworks themselves. Thus, for Dewey, not every object qualifies as art. To me, art more closely resembles an intangible attitude or moment; yet, the artwork remains a mediator and pathway capable of triggering such attitudes or moments. An artwork, in this sense, serves as a guide towards an artistic attitude and as a clue that allows imagining a wholly different other. It is precisely the artwork's characteristics of being unstructured and indeterminate that sustain such imaginative possibilities.

Jacques Derrida once pointed out that the very form of questioning within Western philosophy already repeats certain metaphysical assumptions, asserting that it is not merely the "content" but the "form" of questioning itself that needs to be subverted.[39] Yet, subverting form can become a risky or even reckless attempt, as it demands a fundamental shift in our framework of perception. However, I believe that within art's valued framework of openness and informality, imagining the impossibility of perceiving and sensing the world, or envisioning the unpredictability of life, may not necessarily require profound subversion. Perhaps art's questions have always emerged from chaotic and even

[38] John Dewey, *Art as Experience* (New York: Minton, Balch & Company, 1934), chap. 3.

[39] Jacques Derrida, *Of Grammatology*, trans. Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1974), pt. 1, chap. 2, "Linguistics and Grammatology," 131.

unintelligible forms, gradually enabling the expansion of perception. While escaping anthropocentric thought is nearly impossible, bound as we are within human bodies, those same bodies occasionally guide us into strange experiences beyond our usual cognition. Thus, "subversion" might merely be a modest act of following these unfamiliar sensations. And perhaps even these sensations remain fundamentally human; indeed, sometimes our earnest desire to surpass anthropocentrism may ironically reflect human arrogance more than anything else.

The feelings of confusion, frustration, guilt, and helplessness that the climate crisis instills in me each day dismantle my everyday perceptions, creating uncanny ruptures. I must continually lose my direction, walking forward without even knowing what I am searching for. Perhaps such wandering and imperfection are all too human, yet I must follow them nonetheless. Remembering John Dewey's assertion that the reason we are captivated by artistic experiences is not simply for their pleasure, but because such moments pull us away from the familiar sensations of life and compel us to perceive the world anew, I recall Gaston Bachelard's words, "Always, imagination surpasses life itself."

Standing amidst the climate crisis, I have continuously rewritten the intersection between life and art, inviting you into an experiment by questioning whether this 'rewriting' itself could become an exhibition. As John Dewey suggests, if "experience is the way a living organism integrates itself within its environment," and if art represents a "highly condensed experience of life's moments," then how do you integrate yourself with your environment, and what aesthetic experiences are you undergoing? If that experience is your art, why would it be impossible to exhibit it within your most intimate space? Why couldn't your exhibition simply take the form of a poem?

Bachelard argues that every space we imagine is essentially a poetic space arising from the depths of our being. He states, "Our intimate spaces are the houses shaped by our unconscious, and the house is a place where memories and

dreams intersect."[40] Then, this poetic space arising from within you is precisely the intersection where your life meets art, the place of meaning that you continuously construct—and it is already, in itself, an exhibition.

The moment of art arrives unexpectedly, but an exhibition consciously prepares us to await that moment. Ultimately, an exhibition is an act of sharing and mutual resonance. Thus, I encourage you to invite others into your exhibition. Make your space an ongoing exhibition, always awaiting the moment of art, and write it into poetry.

Now, your exhibition is nearing its end. Before it closes, give it a title, and invite others to experience it. May your exhibition be a profound success.

HERE, AGAIN

I wanted to fail better, but I failed at failing. I lacked the courage to fall apart completely and was too determined to write poetry. My life is far too secure, and the disaster images on the screen are too close—so close that they paradoxically become distant. Today again, I pace anxiously, yet end up doing nothing but filling my stomach and lying down again.

I send this exhibition to you. I hand over to you the authority to open it. This is only an exhibition proposal, not the exhibition itself. The authority and responsibility to transform it into an exhibition belong to you.

This is not an invitation. My exhibition stopped three years ago, and I am still not ready to open it with my own hands. Not knowing whether it's permissible to open an exhibition—or what kind of exhibition it should even be—I have shifted that responsibility onto you.

But don't worry too much. Our exhibition will be small and humble, so even if it fails, it won't leave a significant impact. How fortunate we are not to have the power to change the world. Thus, feel free and safe to open the exhibition, again.

---

[40] Gaston Bachelard, *The Poetics of Space*, trans. Maria Jolas (Boston: Beacon Press, 1994; first published as *La Poétique de l'espace* [Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1958]), 17–18.

The Pathway

Yun Dong-ju[41]

I have lost it
Yet I do not know what's lost and where.
With both hands I check through my pocket

Now I am heading forward hugging around the wall,
Which along repeats of same stone pieces does appear
One after another
With iron-gate locked hard, the wall does its shadow sprawl
And the path leads to even' from morning,
Then 'gain from eventide to the morning

As I look up at sky while groping the wall in tears,
Shamefully in azure the sky appears
Yet I'm walking through on this grassless pathway
For I've myself
On the other side of wall still thus stay,
And for I'm alive but to seek what I've lost myself

- English Translation by Myung-Ho Lee

[41] Yun Dong-ju (1917–1945) was a Korean poet who lived during the Japanese colonial occupation of Korea. Deeply ashamed of his inability to participate actively in the independence movement, he expressed his sorrow and inner turmoil through resistance poetry filled with introspection on the tragedy of losing his homeland. Eventually, Yun became involved with a nationalist group, was arrested by the Japanese police, and subjected to medical experiments in Fukuoka prison, where he died at the young age of 27, after 1 year and 7 months of imprisonment. Yun believed that study and poetry should become one with life itself. It was this conviction—this attempt to align his poetry with his lived experience—that gives his work such profound simplicity and sincerity.