《2》

Again, let the game begin.

Fill in the blanks, Triangles, Trajectories, Repaint, and Scatter papers.

That's all you need to know to join the game.

"Is it possible to re-make the same exhibition again? What does it mean?" While these questions might seem apt as the opening lines, they ultimately fail both formally and content-wise. The concept of "making an exhibition again" presupposes an a priori condition and its continuity, implying a pre-existing structure inherent in the act. The "re-making" mentioned in the initial sentence is thus confined within specific conditions, almost as if placed within parentheses. (*Oh, the time of "2," thwarted from the beginning.*)

An exhibition as a medium does not allow for repetition. We can say that an exhibition occurs through a mechanism of control that prevents repetition and expansion within a limited time and space. The process of hypothesizing, intersecting perceptions, and shaping them into a form, using "a single" event as a guiding principle, may be called "exhibition making." I think of the exhibition medium as a kind of oblivion device, racing to the end with the beginning, and to the beginning for the sake of the end. (*Wait, you say "exhibition as a medium"? You must be a curator! - said with a pejorative tone.*)

An exhibition, once opened with great acclaim and then concluded with nothing left behind, is often vilified and scorned. We witness similar scenes throughout exhibitions filled with empty words and images. Exhibitions that rush to oblivion are perceived as equivalent to (over)consumption and (super)markets, infiltrated by impure attitudes and skepticism. However, an exhibition still conveys imperfect yet universal artistic concepts and forms

(e.g., modernism, abstract painting, etc.). This raises the question: Can today's exhibition become a "singular" event that can lift values from the ground of oblivion and consumerism and bind them to a different temporality? Is this double entendre that accompanies the temporality of an exhibition—or, to put it more bluntly, its historicity—really something to be avoided?

《2》 begins with the desire to reexhibit Ko's recent solo exhibition *This Way and That* (2024, Interim[1]), and extends to other works/scenes that the artist encountered by chance, such as another solo exhibition, *Puzzle that Tunes* (2022, Hall 1). The number "2" here refers to a condition that presupposes something that precedes it, a condition of an expandable network, a space-time of continuity and repetition. I present this exhibition as an attempt to move and facilitate past events/exhibitions, to pluralize and expand beyond mere (re)production.

《2》 adopts the methods and rules of Ko's painting as its own methodology. The exhibition highlights the fact that the fulfillment of these rules is equivalent to an image in the artist's work, concretely confirming and sharing the process by which the method of image formation provides the pretext for abstract painting. In other words, the exhibition is a self-reproduction of Ko's paintings and can be understood as a three-dimensional extension of them. Here are some of the methods and rules used by the artist, which form the basis of the exhibition: 1. Fill in the blanks: Ko creates his paintings by filling in the pre-sketched (grided) blanks. Each square is connected and related to the others by a single event. From the gaps in the initially unbalanced grids of different sizes, the artist

---

[1] Interim, which opened in September 2023, is an "artist-run space created in part of the three artists' collaborative studio" that hosted "three solo exhibitions (including Geunho Ko's solo show), two two-person exhibitions, and a group exhibition and a performance programme," and announced its closure on 10 July.

finds another space for balance. 2. Triangles: The triangle, which often appears in his paintings, creates various situations. It can serve as a tool for creating a center (or absence), a signpost for direction, an obstacle to be avoided, or a background against which conditions (fulfilment) are checked and imagined. 3. Trajectories: Ko draws a trajectory on the conditions he has constructed. If the squares and triangles are the elements of the conditions, the trajectory records the (improvised and accidental) "wayfinding" and "wandering" within those conditions. The artist imagines the movement on the canvas, building up or cutting away trajectories, and filling in the areas created by the trajectories with color. 4. Repaint: The artist redraws or repaints a completed work anew. The pre-drawn plan, following the rules of 1-3, always reveals the gaps between the plan and drawn/painted images. The artist actively imagines these gaps, exploring the ripples of difference that redrawing and repainting reveal.[2]

These rules are the conditions for painting to occur. They are painted and drawn on canvases. A painting created according to a systematic process and set of rules may seem like a digital code with its own generative logic. However, the work ultimately ends up as an image that is not fully codified and cannot be completely explained by the rules that were the starting point. The work builds and deconstructs its own structure, making "abstract painting" possible. This inability to perfectly follow the rules is particularly evident in Ko's recent solo show, *This way and that*. The impossibility of adhering to the rules is ironically reestablished as a necessary condition for the organization of another image-generating "method." The exhibition, which enforced a few rules, created signposts on the canvas, and laid out layers of traces that literally go "this way and that," was perhaps an attempt to methodologize the breaking of rules once again. Here, the method seems

---

[2] For an explanation of "some of the methods/rules" mentioned in that paragraph, from Author's Notes (2024).

to be more of a combination or game that enables pictorial development (including the previous non-rules) rather than an act of repeating the order.

The age-old question of "How to read a painting?"[3] sets up painting as an object of reading or decoding, often focusing on understanding the metaphor, symbolism, meaning, and narrative of the image. This exhibition shifts the question of how to read a painting back towards the "how." Instead of interpreting the images as allegorical narratives and concepts, viewers are invited to read the paintings themselves, examining the structure of their formulation. The "how" of the exhibition is closely linked to a major inflection point in the history of painting: the transition from representation to abstraction. By departing from subject matter, the method of painting has not only secured the independence and uniqueness of the medium but has also established the logic of the occurrence of the "abstract." Geunho Ko's method, which does not presuppose a subject, goes through its own (un)process and continues the game of generating abstract paintings. 《2》 proposes tracing this method and its generated images. By grasping the essence of the "method-image" that multiplies in the exhibition space, we hope to read Ko's paintings as part of a continuous process, within an expanded space-time.

《2》 invites viewers to enter a network that traces paintings oscillating between (unperformable) rules and (atypical) configurations. It asks the viewer to join the game, participating in the painting/exhibition as a physical presence, moving beyond the virtual world of screens. As a curator, I want you to re-sense the present and its visual field within the ecosystem of painting. This ecosystem seems to visualize a kind of escape or error while questioning the fragmented space-time and algorithmic behavior

---

[3] For example, in his 1961 article "How to read a painting - Adventures of the mind", art historian Ernst Gombrich analyses the details of Maurits Cornelis Escher's labyrinthine paintings, explaining that there is more to art/images than meets the eye.

recognition of digital media and smartphones.

Games are not an unfamiliar language in art. From recent works that follow the grammar of video, web, and digital games to earlier examples like Fluxus, games have long been integrated into artistic practices; As simulations, possibilities for anomalous thinking, games reconsider the old-fashioned art. George Maciunas follows Duchamp's insistence that "every chess player is an artist"[4] and calls for a "purge of bourgeois banality, of intellectuals, experts and commercialized culture, (...) exterminate imitation, artificial art, abstraction, and reproduction."[5] Another Fluxus member, Ken Friedman, spoke of the game of art as a "paradigm-shifting play." Their games, with their emphasis on radicality and playfulness, could be seen as working against the (painting) medium rather than for it.

Ko's games, however, function for painting and attempt to establish a structure that culminates in painting. The exhibition asks whether Ko's "method" considers the medium of painting itself and the conventions that condition it as a kind of ready-made or found object. Furthermore, by setting up painting as an already mixed medium (intermedia), an incomplete image, it hypothesizes a situation where the game is set in motion, expanding into a game/network of another reality.

Here, one might ask why "abstract painting" is being re-read as concrete specificity, and why the notion of universality it implies is being replaced by the anti(/non) aesthetic logic of games. The exhibition still sets the "incompleteness" of the universal as the object of reading and translation. By approaching the universal from the point of the specific, and reconsidering the metaphorical nature of the medium, it imagines a scene where abstract painting/exhibition occupies a slightly different function and

---

[4] See Bernard Marcadé, *Marcel Duchamp: La vie à credit* (FLAMMARION, 2007).

[5] George Maciunas, Manifesto (1963, The Gilbert and Lila Silverman Fluxus Collection).

temporality today.

《2》 places Ko's paintings in a continuous time and space of past-present-future or here-and-there. Although likened to a game, the exhibition does not follow the usual definition[6]: it has no obstacles or goals, no procedures or competitions, and no winners and losers. When contemporary art itself is likened to a gloomy "end game," what kind of game could this exhibition play? Could it open up another event as a variation and extension of the method and process, not as an end game predicated on failure, but as an attempt to leapfrog the present of familiar generality, of incomplete universality, and even to say that it has been entirely within (painting/exhibition/art medium)? Let the game begin. The words you will need are:

Fill in the blanks, Triangles, Trajectories, Repaint, and Scatter papers.

That's all you need to know.

Hyukgue Kwon

---

[6] Cf. Jesper Juul, *Handmade Pixels: Independent Video Games and the Quest for Authenticity* (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2019)