

## The Cocktail Talks—on Curating

Esther Lu (E): It's so hard to say when and where we met each other for the first time. It likely would have been at some sort of art occasion, some party with drinks. Did we ever have a deep conversation with each other over a glass of wine or a cocktail? To be honest, three of us were not close enough to really know each other before working together. We had the typical and classic distance that acquaintances have in the art circle: some politeness mixed with a skin-deep kind of understanding or critique. Anyway, our fates and curatorial careers crisscrossed with one another in an unexpected way. There was this long period when I had this feeling, "Oh my god, why do I have to see you every morning, and why do I still have to see you when I get drunk?" Haha!

What is running an independent art space together all about?

In 2015, we were teamed up to run TCAC. For the first time, there would be art professionals in charge of TCAC's operation and program, instead of having the board volunteer to do all the work. It was a turning point to modify and institutionalize TCAC. As we reflect on it now, we can all agree that TCAC still runs with a curatorial consciousness seven years after this operation model was established. Our two-year program *Where Are We Now? The Banyan Tree, Index, Exercise and Personal Ads* was a clear demonstration and a meeting point of our curatorial projections. We worked so hard, and we laughed and cried too.

Many projects were accomplished, and half of them failed. For me, it is quite critical and important to understand the relationship between the life of the institution and of our curatorial practice. Such tension was the foundation of the operation during our term, and I would like to begin this conversation with it to explore the psychological structure and characteristics of our work.

Fang Yen Hsiang (F): I remember when TCAC was about to move out of Andong Street, there were many speculations suspended on the possible future of the board. At the time, I was participating in a residency workshop at ACC in Gwangju before its official launch. After visiting the Seoul Biennale, I asked myself a question at a cafe in Myeongdong, "What are the potentials of art spaces in Taiwan? Do we have too many fixed categories, missions and projections on how art can be produced, displayed, communicated and learned? Can we see it as an organism that grows and transforms in relation to the entire art community and circle?" In addition to this, since contemporary art and curating are practices to be learned and explored via doing, can we conceive of art space as a curriculum for ourselves? I thought that might be an interesting opportunity.

My career has circulated around the role of artist, exhibition maker and curator. Before TCAC, I had participated in Open Contemporary Art Center and

Ping Pong Art Space. The focus of my practice concerns production, and I am used to developing collaboration with artists and making collective decisions. It has become an intuition to continue artistic production in my daily life. All the demands and methods for knowledge, technology, initiation and network can be driven and propelled in my romantic pursuit.

After TCAC, I began to work in a public museum. I have come to realize that the difference in applying my practice and production is not solely about "autonomy," or the scale of resources. The gap is located in the scale of sensibility, time, and parameters for thinking due to having different targets and approaches for communication. In comparison to public institutions, our work at TCAC required our effort to collectively construct all kinds of emotional and sensible exchanges and share them. We were all "independent curators" at TCAC in this aspect. Our institutional practice could be considered the production form and project objective.

E: TCAC was my first official institutional curating experience. Prior to it, I had always worked as an independent curator despite having quite a number of experiences in collaborating with art institutions. It was a major shift for me to suddenly take over the responsibilities of an art space director. Nevertheless, I did have many projections toward what an independent art space could be, as institutional critique

has been one of my key research subjects, and I had seen so many different art space models in varying scales around the world during my curatorial study and research trips. This first-hand research and observation allowed me to understand multiple realities, challenges, societies and cultures across Europe and Asia, with respect for different contexts. I believe the production of an independent art space is a solid practice that demands social responsibility and a super imagination to transcend the reality of local conditions.

I took the job because I wanted to embrace this challenge. I wanted to fulfill my curatorial desire and measure the distance between my passion and my ideals, and at the same time to build the infrastructure by operating an art space for the public that would exceed my personal aesthetic tastes and desires. I believed I would learn about the flow and flux of cultural production while mastering institutional practice. TCAC offered me the opportunity to sit deep in the middle of the cultural environment and learn all of its problems.

I can give you an example to describe the differences between independent curating and institutional curating at TCAC for me: two years, three people and one self-assembled vehicle. I used to just run by myself. Then one day, I had to drive a colorful car that was full of specialized weather functions and had funny settings. I think, for me personally, my

destination remained the same. However, this assembled car could be very needy. Often I had to pull over to fix it or make detours. My hands got dirty, and my face was full of sweat. Is it faster to drive? I don't know. But, it is different to drive. Is fixing a car more exhausting or running by oneself? Is speed a relevant issue? Is there any standard for it in life? There is probably no correct answer. It comes to me as a very natural thing to do. I may run, swim, walk, drive, hitchhike or fix a car farther down on this road. It does not matter how I move. This road is the line my life would draw.

F: We all understand curating involves the redistribution of resources and materials. Sometimes, this was even more decisive than concepts. Our two-year program was planned with a tight budget and resources. I want to know how you prioritized different works during that period.

For me, this question actually can serve as a reference to understand a curator's fundamental attitude, and it predetermines the overall relations among materials, people and the environment in a project. By learning what your necessities are, as well as your survival instincts, your curatorial "body type" or "destiny" has the possibility to be revealed.

Jo Ying Peng (J): TCAC is a peculiar case by itself. It can be as heavy as an elephant, but it can also be completely light and flexible at other times. I often felt like an amoeba when working at TCAC,

as I needed to adapt to the ever-changing scenarios. If there was any priority, it was to be responsive, and there is no fixed parameter for that. The experience of the three of us working as the curatorial and operations team was an opportunity for me to redefine what institutional curating could be, and how it was exercised in all kinds of institutional interfaces. Operation is totally pragmatic, and we had to consider the environment, resources and networks. Curating, however, also requires practical sensibilities. We can't separate these two dimensions. So, how to find a sweet spot? To achieve balance between these two aspects is probably the attitude one needs.

E: How interesting it is that you put it this way. I agree that priorities were probably the most different consideration when I had to be responsible for TCAC. As an independent curator, I practically have nothing to lose. But, as a TCAC director/curator, I felt that I was loaded with responsibilities and expectations in terms of producing curatorial content that was relevant to the institution's prosperity and engaging various cultural producers to maximize certain effects, exchanges, networks, resources, etc. For instance, these could be different parameters when choosing whom to work with and how to work together. If I work independently, on the other hand, I will probably consider friendship and fun more. Easy.

Well, building institutional

credibility and resource integration were just parts of a very natural process, and I wouldn't even describe it as any sort of compromise, especially since TCAC was so much in need of more people's care and engagement. I made sure that such an interface was as open as possible. I used to say that I wanted to turn TCAC into an instrument that everybody could come to play and make different music and noise out of it. That would be the most beautiful thing to me—it had become a desirable site, a sexy place. You could also say that it was so much about building a space or a community, but it was actually more about contributing to certain awareness and consciousness for the commons, and then possibly a kind of movement.

Therefore, all the priorities in TCAC were filtered to meet such purposes for me. I would prioritize integration, circulation, distribution and exchange so much more than specific resources or people, as it was, after all, about building a better art scene, but not a personal reputation for any unnecessary heroism. At the same time, TCAC operates with a different currency, and manifests a different production relationship in the art ecology. Every decision involved mindful calculation and balance for establishing long-term influence, immediate functionality or sometimes just for the sake of pure experimentation. We really wanted to test the limit for such a small institution with our curatorial intervention, so I think our TCAC curatorial methodology

was something quite interesting, unique and likely to be separated from our independent practice.

J: Since I left TCAC, I began working as an independent curator. For me, I feel the difference is in the production relationship with artists. When working at TCAC, most of the collaboration was conceived for the needs of program contents. Before each production, there were more or less some political considerations in the communication and negotiation. For independent curators, certainly there was also business around resources, responsibilities and production conditions to be identified before approaching artists. But, I feel the overall condition is more elastic. On top of it, trust is the key to collaboration. The distance with artists is more intimate for me.

Do you want to reflect the differences between independent curator and institution curator for you, particularly in terms of production relation and condition?

E: I think what I enjoy the most as an independent curator is the genuine exchanges with artists. It's more like building a personal conversation and relationship, trying to share and learn together, walking along with each other's practices without particular aims or purposes. I follow my curiosity and instinct, preference and ideas to explore such relationships, and do my best to contribute my thoughts.

The institutional role, however,

comes with a responsibility for the curator to provide a "professional service" to artists and the audience. When I invite an artist on behalf of an institution, it comes along with a package of the institution's credibility, resources and objectives. You can say that the political and economic relationships are usually more complicated in such collaboration conditions. Sometimes I think there is some ambiguity between these two roles that I feel is not easy to resolve. For instance, as an independent curator, I try to pay professional fees. If I don't find the money, then I usually don't push for realization. As an institutional curator, there are times that I can only afford paying symbolic fees for artists, even though I may have an even bigger role and responsibility to ensure the circulation of the art economy. It is to say that in the art economy there runs many layers of visible and invisible exchange. Moreover, working for an institution means that you are inheriting networks and resources that are subject to various delicate relationships. Therefore, it's a lot of political exercise within the institutional context. There are different ways to make things happen.

F: Wu Chi-Yu often teases that I am a big fat critic. However, when I review my trajectory, I find my artistic or curatorial life is somehow based on a kind of (wrong) assumption, which is surrounded by all sorts of suggestions or speculations on how a particular work can develop, how to find a different display, how

to create misunderstanding, what else artists can explore, etc.

That being said, collaboration and friendship between a curator and an artist would be based on mutual trust and tolerance. The conversations and stimulations between them are driven by the desire to find a breakthrough. Such intimacy and necessity would then create a curatorial network.

Even though I work in a public museum now, I still hope to provoke the existing framework of cultural policies and urban development plans through different projects.

E: How were both of your personal curatorial interests reflected in the TCAC curatorial platform? For instance, *Jo*, why did you like leading *Curatorial School*, our library projects and efforts in art publishing? Can you share the intersection of your interests and TCAC functions? What kind of vision do you apply to these projects? It would be nice to hear your answer for the previous question too.

J: Printed works and books are full of imagination for me. Mexican artist Ulysses Carrión who lived in Europe since the 70s published a representative manifesto about publishing, writing and editing. He considered books as the vehicles of display, and this concept inspires me a lot. I have always been obsessed with the aesthetics of artist books and alternative publishing in contemporary art. *The One Day Vernacular Bookstore*

that I assisted in organizing at TCAC was a series of curated pop-ups, each with a selected theme. The artists' prints and international art publications in this series offered different approaches other than exhibition catalogues, and the limited edition prints also addressed different editorial aesthetics.

*Curatorial School* was more like an encounter of fate. It was one of the first projects that I managed to run in the very beginning. So, it turned out to be an experience of co-learning and co-production.

E: Yen Hsiang, what about your curatorial approaches for *Video Lounge* or other projects?

F: *Video Lounge* was a project initiated at the time of the relocation of TCAC to Baoan Street. During the renovation process, I thought it could be an open space for video works, people could come to watch videos, read or just chat. A multimedia reading room in an old community! What a powerful addition!

Later I thought it could be more like the subconscious space of TCAC, like a slightly hidden memory beneath our daily operation. It could be a temporary memory space that would be erased after events, a space for self-exile and hidden secrets... It happened that there was this heavy iron door at the entrance of the *Video Lounge*. One could literally lock him or herself down in the basement. The visual design of *Video Lounge* was associated

with images like islands, oceans and moons which responded to the images that early video artists once envisioned for new media art. It was a body to be birthed and was a site to resemble messages, consciousnesses and sensibilities, full of vitality and mysteries.

My curatorial approach for *Video Lounge* was to abandon existing classification and genres. Although *Video Lounge* was based on the formal TCAC artist archive and external collaboration, I thought the concept to explore the connections between "video as archive" and "video as event" were vital in my response to audiences who are either obsessed with archives or with moving images. Some of my curatorial keywords were friendship, unusual love, and object. I was exploring variable conditions of seeing, either from the selection of collaborating curators or themes that emphasize specific entries that belong to our cultural ecology.

Esther, *Made in Public* was an extension of your previous curatorial project, and it seems you attempted to develop multiple paths to address the conception of 'the public', in order to broaden what it usually would be defined as in Taiwan. Generally speaking, it may refer to something that is negotiated among political or public resources and redistribution of interests. I am curious to know your view on the idea of public in your curatorial practice. Perhaps it is a subversive act within institutions or other gestures.

E: I have been trying to apply institutional critique in my curatorial practice, much like a musician who has a similar chorus in every song. I am probably kind of old school and still feel romantic about avant-garde art and activism. I just can't give up the idea of producing criticality from a project, it always grows from a certain social, political, historical context, and reflects important issues for us. I believe that art's force can be penetrating and revealing; art is an immaterial production that produces and transmits commons—knowledge, affection, relationship and so on for society. As a cultural practitioner, I do care a lot about what role art can play in society and what kind of conversation can take place in different people's minds. It is within such a public sphere that culture grows and evolves.

So, to make it brief, I think the way that I think about the public sphere, institutional critique and curatorial practice would be based on my belief that art could be an agent of change for people. However, I don't try to instrumentalize art for any political purpose. Perhaps they can share the same illusion, art is about approaching the possible truth while politics is mostly based on rhetoric. I do believe art can be critical, and is a critical matter for any society and a quality of the human mind.

*Made in Public* is an outspoken example, it built a variety of references and networks to

understand the practice and imagination of culture works in the aspect of social activism—especially in different contexts, places and communities. It allows a close reading of the methods of creating commons and the public sphere. These case studies do more than name drop; they actually try to depict the human condition.

F: Our two-year program was titled *The Banyan Tree, Index, Exercise and Personal Ads*—can we review our thoughts concerning these two years of collaboration via such naming? I guess we had our individual projections, and I hope to know and understand your different opinions.

For me, contemporary art or curating is a subject of my long-term "exercise," which can carry various meanings. It can be the labor of dish-washing in a morning market, the protest in front of the parliament, or the *Body Work* workshop led by Tyler Coburn. "The Banyan Tree" is where we are. "Index" refers to the methodologies of knowledge production. "Personal Ads" calls toward the unknown futures, unexpected people and audiences. It depicts a vivid image of what a contemporary art center looks like in front of an old temple.

J: You forgot the most important part of the main title. Its full name is *Where Are We Now? The Banyan Tree, Index, Exercise and Personal Ads*. Our title stood as an open reflection on our very own reality and condition. As we had just

started to run TCAC, it unfolded our anxiety and excitement for the future with four suggestive hints: the public, the institution, programs and audiences. Instead of projecting a future it revealed more realities.

F: I came to realize that expanded sensibilities played an important role in Esther's curatorial practice during our collaboration. Although sometimes it was not exposed as a visible methodology, it still flowed like a kind of subconsciousness. I want to hear more from you in this regard, and how it has been reflected in your recent curatorial projects and contents.

E: Perhaps it's all about building a sexy place? Haha!

Art could be an obscure language. Art speaks through our senses. Today, art does not necessarily stay or attach to objects. Art could be something totally in the air. We, as curators, work to present art, mediate art and communicate beyond art. We also need to develop personal tools for display and performance to master our craft and shape our vision through different expressions. What are the most common tools for curators? Text, space and design.

I personally regard language as a problematic tool, as it has a hegemonic power structure and is, historically speaking, quite patriarchal too. As a female curator, I think I am more or less fighting for finding alternative ways to speak in this regard. Yet, I am still struggling with shaping a writing style that I

can feel totally happy with. On the other hand, I find myself sensitive to space, and am so attracted to playing around with other sensual languages. More and more I realize that my curatorial projects actually focus a lot on creating a conceptual space—physically and metaphysically.

Another thing I should mention concerns my view on the relationship between modernity and body. I think the body is actually the frontier, the site, and at the same time a cul-de-sac of modernization. Body is the medium of our encounter with cultures and the world. The way we carry our body and exercise senses is fascinating for me. In recent years, I've been very interested in exploring body-space relations within the discourse of display politics and art theories as one of my curatorial subjects.

The most representative project would be *TCAC in the Future Tense: Unit, Conjugation and Discursive Artefacts*, that we collaborated on with Oliver Klimpel. It tells expressively and physically about our expectation toward the spatial discourse of TCAC. The series of institutional furniture creates imaginary and undefined space, and also creates the possibility to find new meanings among visual contrasts, or to challenge the fundamental attitude toward art display to reflect our institution's mission and role.

I can continue talking about our TCAC furniture and space design and the design for *Portrait Portrait*

to no end with pride and many smiles. But, I guess you want to ask me about *Salon Spice*?

J: Indeed. Esther kicked off a brand new program series *Salon Spice* right after Yen Hsiang and I left TCAC. Taking a departure from “body politics,” the series explored many related ideologies in the art context, as the extension of Butler's articulation on performativity, or a reflection toward what you just described as the hegemonic power structure imposed on female curators. Do you want to elaborate more on your curatorial concepts and articulations for *Salon Spice*?

E: When I was left alone as the director and only curator at TCAC, I had to make new considerations and react differently to pressures of the role. By that time, I had already learned how TCAC could function as a space and an institution, knowing its strengths and weaknesses. I thought the best I could do would be to come up with a new curatorial approach to orchestrate all the resources together with my personal interests. *Salon Spice* was born from this as a space experiment. Based on co-learning workshop models, it connected a series of research, display, art production, performance and event. The subject was tied to body politics for giving a solo gravity in the hope of cultivating thematic discussions. I was imagining how to run a 21st century salon with a single curator, and how to create dialogues and connections between ideas and practices. There we had many interesting attempts to rethink

body, gender, and performativity. It also happened that same-sex marriage was the biggest social movement in Taiwan at the time. We hosted some discussions on transgender, stigmatization, feminism, queer culture... Students from TNUA organized workshops here, international artists approached us and wanted to fly over, and we invited Shu Lea Cheang to speak, too. For the space itself, Su Hui-Yu once transformed it into a porn library, and Tyler Coburn transformed it into a gym. Tyler organized a study group, a workshop to develop new exercise proposals, and we filmed a video that was full of politically incorrect exercises and gestures (<https://vimeo.com/255040824>)! I really enjoyed the program and adored the contributions by many participating artists. Nevertheless, I still felt much regret for not being able to develop further discourse in a more solid way, as I was obliged to many other responsibilities as the director at the same time.

F: If we try to think about these personal touches, concerns or characteristics of a curator, I think both of you take an intimate approach to reading and writing, to their variable agencies and performativity. This stands out in the contemporary art scene in a way, especially when archives and documents have been quite popular in recent years. Can you share a bit more about your curatorial ambition and intention?

E: You can say this is a kind of personal approach or a reflection

on the idea of historiography against the background of today's trendy topics. I have issues with language as told previously. So it won't be difficult to imagine that I certainly have doubts about the intention of making another official narrative for history with archives or documents. You can have one hundred documents, but you still can't say that they reveal the truth. I think such skepticism is necessary. Materials such as documents and archives are important references and indexes, but sometimes they pretend to provide the authentic truth, and this could be misleading and dangerous. They are important because they can serve as agents for us to consider and imagine the bigger unknown, so I would agree if you describe my approach as shedding light on performativity.

J: Unlike Esther, I do not struggle to trust language at all. I am attracted to the nature and texture of language and how it is applied in aesthetic form. I wonder if you remember the curator tour at the opening of *Portrait Portrait*. I gave a reading:

What is a scenario?

A scenario is a key.

A key to open *Portrait Portrait*, inviting you to an alternative dimension for histories.

A scenario is a verb, setting up a backstage for imagination as well as a live scene of a metatheatre.

You will see at the corner: a landscape painting in an extravagant scale, the horse dance from the abandoned rubber

plantation in the Malay archipelago, a poster station for protests, and a brief local folk song history.

Scenario #1 as the opening adjective, it is organic, rebellious, transcending and magnetic.

Scenario #1 as the opening noun, it is a dialogue of marginal histories. What is scenario #1?

It is the switch for the motion mode of *Portrait Portrait*.

I didn't want it to be too formal or boring. Two hours before the opening, I sat at the neighboring noodle stand, eating and improvising at the same time. It was simply my intuition, but perhaps it said how I was fond of performative language. It was not limited to reading and writing in the way Yen Hsiang meant, but was even more general as to what language was. I am interested in "performance lecture," in which language becomes pure materiality, giving narration to image, text, body and sound.

I have a question for Yen Hsiang, too. *So Far, So Right: A Study of Reforms and Transitions Across Borders* was a curatorial project developed when you were still working at TCAC. It began with you following-up on some encounters with individuals, and tracing their lives. Later, it was a larger mapping across Europe and Asia for a post-communist narrative. The aesthetic language was so personal. I am curious to know how you applied it in the work of TCAC.

F: The residency and exhibition took place after I left TCAC, so it was more like a parallel project that was conceived in a different status.

In our TCAC program, we tended to bring all kinds of subjects and contents, from personal emotion, design language to historical narrative, into the public arena or framework. *So Far, So Right*, however, took a very different trajectory to interweave small trans-national stories into a larger history account, which was again tilted, rewritten and mapped. If we compare two curatorial approaches, *Portrait Portrait* assembled multiple narratives, and *So Far, So Right* told an epic about the world not being what you thought.

E: You have always given some special attention to the life of artists. We can see it during our collaboration and also from your long-term practice. It is the embedded desire and sensible connection to relate to artists rather than just works, so your curatorial practice glows with a particular temperament. For instance, you proposed "bio archive" as the research methodology. In the opening of *Video Lounge*, you invited artists to show their first video works. I believe these strategies that revealed your personal relations and your epistemology to read art history also grounded your take to balance institution curating/ writing and artists' lives. Would you like to elaborate on your views, particularly in response to how TCAC runs as an independent art space, its task for contributing to art history and how you see the relation between curating and art history in your personal role?

F: The late critic/artist Wu Shu-An once asked me a similar question about why I cared so much about narratives in my recent curation. If I take this chance to think about it, my investigations around contemporary societies indeed concern how narratives on lives are transformed or deformed in varying fictional reconfigurations.

I am interested in finding new approaches for historiography and “historicity” in contemporary curating. It consists of multiple pasts and futures for objects. It can be generated from our personal experiences and intuitions, and our interactive playful projections on History. This is something that I have been experimenting in curatorial narratives.

E: I have a fascinating observation. If there are any common personalities we share, I would say that three of us are romantics. Jo may look more like the party type, and in the beginning I thought you would be the one who pushed for decisions that were more hyper and unrealistic. Nevertheless, my experience told me that you offered the most grounded structure in our teamwork, demanding pragmatic calculations and a sense of reality. You are also sensitive to institutional structure, curatorial structure, looking for new possibilities in every little attempt to deconstruct existing conditions—of space, of narratives or visual communication. How have you grown these ideas of institutional critique in your practice? How did it influence the way you curated in TCAC? Do you

want to talk about the complexity and struggle in institutional curating and our experiments in operation? Would you propose a different method if you had a second chance?

J: Hmm, does it have to be so complex and full of struggles? It reminds me of an old sentence we used, “I am so sexy!” [1] I think we do not need to go around with the term institution. Instead, we have to be ready to restart from ground zero. I think operation can also be a subversive agent. It really depends on your thinking. I know it is easier to just speak about it. I also need to be honest with myself if I really achieved what I told myself I would in my curatorial practice at TCAC, or if it was full of my illusions.

Esther, as the director, you had most of the responsibilities for management and coordination. I want to hear your take on “self-organization” and “autonomy” in running a non-profit organization with curatorial experiments.

E: Oh, this question touches such a soft spot for me. To be honest, there were many sleepless nights when I was struggling with management problems and decisions. It was very tough for me, as I considered democracy to be our biggest value in a nutshell, and art organizations should be politically advanced or even progressive in dealing with institutional management or non-management. This is not a company that drives for maximal benefits or efficiency. This is a very special organization that stands

up for labor rights, immaterial production, and you know, our love and respect for TCAC and each other is actually the main drive in our operation. Neither of us stayed for fame or money. We were working together because we shared certain beliefs and values.

So, the way I worked through it was by building models and chemistry. I wanted to mobilize the team by demonstrating ideas in action, and I guess if there was any leadership it was located in interactions during the process, from the discussion, from doing things together. Well, I am not sure if you guys would agree, but I did personally put lots of effort in creating conditions for self-organization in our teamwork. A big reason for this was that I really wished to build a platform for curators to exercise independent practice for the long term. As for autonomy? Oh, yeah, we always had it, no? Who else cared for our organization management?

Apart from that, I really want to hear your comparative readings on collective curating and individual curating. I remember clearly that I asked if you would like to have individual curator credits for each event in the very beginning of our term, and then we decided to go for collective curating and share all the team credits together. Somehow, I keep revisiting this question. Was it the right decision to keep a completely horizontal work structure in our operation? I did hope to run a democratic structure where we had an equal

share of responsibilities, power and paychecks. In a sense, I also gave up the traditional concept of management in our operation. It was consensus but not consent that I was looking for; I felt like building an organic structure to accommodate the different patterns of our lives. Occasionally, I would look back and ask myself if I took on the full responsibilities of director, or did I actually have you share a great part of my work? If we had been properly credited for all our curatorial work, would we have had more sense of honor and made extra efforts? Would we have grown TCAC into a different institution?

F: This seems to circle back to the beginning of our conversation. It was the process of sharing life, daily rhythm, ideas, and even tastes, and the impact was mutual in our team and that shaped TCAC in return. The shape of TCAC also kept changing our conditions. It was quite a long, delicate, rich and extensive experience to generate sensibilities; it was a rare cluster of individual lives and the life of an institution. In my ideal projection, every art institution should have such unique patterns and shapes.

J: "Time" was a physical measurement and a chemistry connecting us. We arrived at TCAC at different times, and we became colleagues and company in each others' lives, sharing our energy, status and events. Then, we said we would not be separate even if we were apart. That positioned a kind of "coordinate" for us to look forward to our expanding futures. Time as

a concept grows in our curatorial lives, providing an insight to further comprehend what it really brings to our practices.

Spring 2018

[1] TCAC Chair Yu Cheng-Ta's response to what TCAC was in our participation in Gwangju Biennial in 2016.