

Author Kim Yoonseo
Source *Open Codes. Networked Commons*
Publisher Nam June Paik Art Center, Yongin

The Art Commons, the Condition of the Museum

Colophon

Editor Kim Yoonseo
Translation Kwak Jae Eun
Designer Kim Kyuho
Published on November 30, 2021

The Art Commons, the Condition of the Museum

In the last chapter of *Mindstorm*, computer scientist Seymour Papert emphasizes the importance of the social aspect of learning.¹ He advises looking at the Brazilian Samba Schools, social club or community centers where people gather to create music and dance routines for carnival. In particular, Papert noticed how these schools bring people of different ages and levels of experience together. Everyone, regardless of whether child or adult, professional or novice, learns lyrics writing, composition, choreography, and other practices to create music and dance based on the traditions and cultures of their local communities. His observation of the Brazilian Samba school has ultimately led to the discovery of the ideal model for applying the computational thinking to everyday life, which is related to the condition of the museum, the theme explored in *Open Codes. Networked Commons*, an exhibition at NJP Art Center. Each of the four words in the title conveys a visual opening. However, are modern high-tech media and culture indeed open to all? How is the reverse side of the complete screen composed and operated? Can all individuals, including children and adults, professionals and novices, come together in dialog within the museum? Is the museum opened to all people? These questions prompted this exhibition, which gradually brought our focus to such concepts as commonality and publicness.

The English word “commons” refers to almost all shared environments surrounding us, from land, air, and water to outer space. It even encompasses social infrastructure, the Internet, broadcasting waves, and intangible intellectual property. The discourse surrounding the commons has appeared in various fields both at home and abroad. In this exhibition, we highlighted how NJP Art Center has noticed and experimented with the museum as commons in our continued research and practices through exhibitions, learning, and symposiums for the last few years. For example, in 2017, NJP Art Center organized the symposium *Future Museum: Public to Commons*, in connection with the exhibition #Art #Commons #NamJunePaik, a celebration of NJP Art Center’s 10 year anniversary.² In his article titled “Art as Commons, Museum as Commons,” Lee Jinkyung who participated in the symposium as one of the speakers, proposed distinguishing between “public goods” and “common goods,” paying attention to the notion of commonality as different from publicness.³ If “being public” means being open to those with specific qualifications, it can simultaneously mean it is closed to the rest. In other words, because publicness as availability

1 Seymour Papert, *Mindstorm: Children, Computers, And Powerful Ideas* (Basic Books: 1993)

2 Lee Sooyoung, the curator of this symposium, said that “from the start, I vaguely knew that Paik’s thought would be related to commons. As I made the thoughts clear on commons, the concept became another key to understand Paik. Paik’s essay “DNA is not racism”(1988) is his personal confession about the art commons, from which it is hard to omit even a single word. See https://www.theartro.kr/kor/features/features_view.asp?idx=2079&b_code=11e

3 Lee Jinkyung, “Art as Commons, Museum as Commons,” *NJP Reader #8 Future Museum: Public to Commons* (Yongin: Nam June Paik Art Center, 2018), 197-206.

can be converted to practical use only when combined with constructive activities, it could become hollow, being emptied as open possibilities, or be used only for a fixed small circle of users. On the other hand, “commonality” as distinct from “publicness” should be understood as “a certain kind of potential that is formed by uniting different things moving together in the same rhythm,” and in connection with common goods. The important aspects of the commons, such as knowledge, language, and cultural resources can become common goods only by the act of using them. Working with cultural assets, like works of art or museums as common goods, is to build a field of creating and enjoying commonality. Similarly, the openness implied in the title, *Open Codes. Networked Commons*, is not limited to being only an “abstract possibility.” What the exhibition particularly aimed to investigate was the idea and spirit of the Samba schools mentioned above, and the common museum created by common activities. The exhibit intended to detect “a rhythmic tuning made by moving together or required to move together,” or with the attributes that museums should or could be equipped.

Open Codes, held at the ZKM | Karlsruhe in 2017, is considered a successful exhibition. “Success” here is that the values produced by the activities of those sharing the ZKM, through the exhibition, were cultivated so that it became a common museum, because various people came to use the Center as a space for thinking. If the previous adaptations of *Open Codes* were distinguished by taking the form of exhibition, gatherings built simultaneously around the museum, and exhibition-related programs, the one held at NJP Art Center in the midst of the pandemic, was defined by being hardly able to organize in-person contact, face to face activities or building temporary communities with strangers.⁴ Since its initiation by ZKM based on Peter Weibel’s thought that the world is composed of and run by the digital code of 1’s and 0’s, the *Open Codes* exhibition has introduced different perspectives in different cities around the world with local artists, creating new sub-themes while maintaining its main theme and message.⁵ This exhibition has evolved by playing with variations on the theme within a flexible structure that allowed a different set of curators and artists each time. The version *Networked Commons* at NJP Art Center aims to investigate the existential methodology of the museum as commons, inspired by the openness of code.

The Purpose of Language

It is inevitable that when speaking of programming or coding to come to the understanding that the world is run and

4
In connection with this exhibition, Nam June Paik Art Center organized online and offline programs. See page 152.

5
Until now various versions of *Open Codes* were realized based on international collaborations. *Open Codes. Living in Digital Worlds* (ZKM | Karlsruhe, 2017.10.20. – 2018. 5. 8.), *Open Codes. The World as a Field of Data* (ZKM | Karlsruhe, 2018. 9. 2. – 2019. 6. 2.), *Open Codes. Digital Culture Techniques* (Max Mueller Bhavan Gallery Mumbai, 2019. 4. 7. – 2019. 6. 2.), *Open Codes. The Art of Coding* (Max Mueller Bhavan Gallery Mumbai, 2019. 2. 2. – 2.10.), *Open Codes. Connected Bots* (Chronus Art Center Shanghai, 2019.7.20. – 10. 7.), *Open Codes. We are Data* (Azkuna Zentroa Bilbao, 2019.10.23. – 2020. 1.26.)

maintained by the numbers one and zero, and to find ultimately that code is a language of communication. Nevertheless, when researching a comparison of code to speaking and writing, a perplexing amount of discussion will also be discovered. In her discussion on the relationship between code and language, Katherine Hayles argues that a complete understanding of the interaction between speaking, writing, and code requires us to not only comprehend these three systems, but also to pay attention to the various conflicts and cooperations between their conceptions of the world.⁶ Although it is generally believed that humanists and linguists and computer programmers and engineers rarely agree with each other, on a global level, programming codes and human languages are constantly interacting with each other in everyday life. Because sound, image, text, and the media related into them, such as films and books, can be converted to digital codes, many theorists like Friedrich Kittler and Lev Manovich assert that there is now only one media, that is, digital computation.⁷ This diagnosis that the one salient feature of our current technological society is the negotiation between, not only language, but also with code, confirms the necessity of considering languages and code together and the need to constantly correct errors related to them, which is also a delineation of this exhibition.

The exhibition's opening takes the form of direct confrontation with the reality of codes that are invisible in everyday life. The first work that visitors see when they enter the exhibition hall is *YOU:R:CODE*, an interactive installation with a mirror and four monitors which shows human beings from the perspective of the object/machine. Walking along a row of screens installed in a long, narrow passageway, visitors will see their reflection, or their perfect analog visual representation, in the mirror at the entrance. Then next to the mirror, on the first screen, they will see a three dimensional scan of their image, an identity constructed from the traces they left as web users on the second screen, and a body that is made up of DNA codes like all living things on the third screen, until finally, their entire human body is completely reconstructed as a barcode. In this way, their body shifts from a virtual depiction to a materialization. Through this process of making viewers confront the change from a mirror image to digital barcodes, *YOU:R:CODE* maximizes the dual meanings implied in the title: "your code" and "you are code."

The subsequent work, a data installation, visitors find is comprised of 25, 18-inch monitors, hanging from the ceiling against a background of windows, and as its title suggests, visualizes Peter Weibel's idea that our life is built up with *The World as a Field of Data*. The 25 monitors display various data from the web, as illegible ciphers filling the whole screen or black-and-white abstract pictures, changing in real-time. A huge number of electronic interfaces, like smartphones, computers, TVs, and digital data screens, have become omni present in the space of our everyday lives, including the operating room, the home, the office, the stock

6 Katherine Hayles, *My Mother Was a Computer: Digital Subjects and Literary Texts* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2005), 54.

7 Lev Manovich, *The Language of New Media* (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 2001). In commemoration of the 15th anniversary of the death of Nam June Paik, Lev Manovich visited Nam June Paik Art Center and had a talk with director Kim Seong Eun on 29 January, 2021. He introduced his cultural analytic research of exploring the cultural topography in the digital environment and discussed the meaning of Paik's thoughts in the digital age from the perspective of today. For the edited version of this talk, see Nam June Paik Art Center's official YouTube channel: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=c_bS4Vxqggc&t=43s

exchange, the airport, and train station. This presence supports the idea that the sun, the moon, and stars no longer lead our way, but rather this role has been handed over to technological devices, including satellites. People living in the digital age do not tell the direction from the position of stars or the sun. Instead, they use navigation apps and follow where the digital device leads. The monitors of *The World as a Field of data* is with us 24 hours a day. Seen against the windows, and against the green hill behind the NJP Art Center, *The World as a Field of Data* sits in such harmony with its setting that it appears to be part of this natural scene.

Nam June Paik's *Key to the Highway (Rosetta Stone)*⁸ a print that served as a source of curatorial inspiration for the realization of the exhibition *Open Codes* at NJP Art Center. This work reflects Paik's concept of the "electronic superhighway" and provides a key to understanding the artist himself, his idea of the commons, and the relationship between art and the role of museums, which are all explored in this exhibition. Although *Key to the Highway (Rosetta Stone)*, a work in the NJP Art Center's permanent collection, has been shown several times in other exhibitions, we decided once again to look into the possibilities of new interpretations when the work is juxtaposed with works by contemporary artists who look at the world through codes. Being code is essentially language for communication, the exhibition aims to examine the Rosetta Stone, an ancient artifact that played an important role in interpreting ancient languages, from some of the earliest recorded history. We paid attention to the fact that written language, one of the oldest mediums ancient people preserved by carving into stone, as a decipherable code. In this work, Paik complied his own hieroglyphic drawings of TV sets, Buddha, cars, satellites, video stills, and his career written in five languages, Korean, English, French, German, and Japanese, as if encrypting it, predicting a future when various languages will be digitized, encoded, shared, and decoded in a global information network. Indeed, Paik used FORTRAN computer programming language as early as 1966. For Paik, who probed the possibilities of visual expression in computer language, with the helpful support of Bell Labs, which encouraged artistic experimentation in the 1960s. When he participated in the FORTRAN workshop at Bell Labs, he investigated the various possibilities of the computer with the hardware available in the lab. These experiments on the computer are reflected in the working process and final results of such works as *Etude I* (1967-1968), *Digital Experiment at Bell Labs* (1967) and *Confused Rain* (1967).⁹ Although, SeungBum Kim and Seoul Express took much interest in Paik's computer

8

Both Curator Jung Yunhoe (Gyeonggi Province Museum), who worked with us in the early stage of the exhibition planning process, and I agreed that *Key to the Highway (Rosetta Stone)* was among Paik's works that is perfect for this exhibition. Kim Seong Eun, director of Nam June Paik Art Center, examined this work's explanatory diagram to display it in the context of this exhibition.

9

Kim Seong Eun, "Intermedia, Interscience: Homo Cyberneticus Evolves," *NJP Reader #3 Cyberneticus* (Yongin: Nam June Paik Art Center, 2012), 14.

experiments but did not conduct in-depth research for this exhibition. Instead, the experiments on the computer that Paik focused on as the creative tool have developed into another version of *Genealogy of the Digital Code* in a larger context.

Scenario, Rules and Execution

Genealogy of the Digital Code, an overview of important milestones in computer technology from the 1800s to the present day, was first realized by the ZKM staff in which visitors watch this genealogy through Jeffrey Shaw's *Linear Navigator* (1999). The timelines were filled with details such as the development of the binary code, early computers, the first neural network, modern computers, and the development of artificial intelligence. Visitors read this history of digital code moving along the wall and watching short videos embedded in it that visualized the texts. For the exhibition at NJP Art Center in 2021, we agreed to upgrade the *Genealogy of the Digital Code*, considering the Korean context in which *Open Codes* would be held. So we asked SeungBum Kim to add a Korean version to *Genealogy of the Digital Code*, which led to the introduction of the first computer in Korean, in which artistic uses of digital codes, and communication tools like languages for users, e-mail, and word processors, and coding education for all students. If the original genealogy, beginning in 1820, selected and showed a few significant achievements in the history of computing technology, Kim's version shows the user/creator position by focusing on the events and impacts that digital code has had on users, who have tried to express and create using computing technology, rather than the developments of new technologies or the user as consumer-oriented achievements. The Korean genealogy is characterized by the striking contrast found in the years before and after this country's rapid modernisation, from the Japanese occupation of Korea, emancipation, Korean War, industrialization, and urbanization. It is only after these historical upheavals that the genealogy began in earnest. It is also worth notice that as one moves closer to the present day, one will find the geo-political borders between nationalities disappear and blur.¹⁰

Alexander R. Galloway claims that code is so different from mere writing, and therefore a special kind of language, in that, "code is the only language that is executable."¹¹ In addition to this, SeungBum Kim regards code as a language that can catch errors in society (where numerous logics and rules are coded and executed) or parts can be rewritten in daily situations. For example, Kim's *I Tried Coding the Condition of Newly-Married Couple* (2020) began with questioning the conditional to define a newly-married couple that he found in a press release for the *Korea Housing Survey 2019* issued by the Ministry of Land, Infrastructure and Transport, Korea. The definition is as follows: "the newly married couple refers to a household whose female spouse is 49 years or younger and married less than seven years."¹² The artist repeatedly rewrote

10
See page 96.

11
Alexander
Galloway,
*Protocol: How
Control Exists after
Decentralization*
(Cambridge,
Mass: MIT Press,
2004), 165.

12
https://www.moiit.go.kr/USR/NEWS/m_71/dtl.js?p?lcmepage=20&id=95083958

and executed by assigning true or false to the conditional in questions using an imaginary coding language in JavaScript. In this process, he reflected public opinions gathered through social media and, as a result, changed the name of one parameter from “wife/husband” to “companion” through the process of rewriting, in an effort to find the appropriate concepts. Despite Kim’s attempt to convert the problematic expressions he found in everyday life to coding language, it is impossible to translate the original meaning accurately, word by word; yet he catches the changes in world view and encourages us to question established absurdities. Kim’s new work, *How to Draw a Perfect Circle*, presented in this exhibition, was inspired by the fact that the command to draw a circle in the graphical coding environment is “ellipse.” He imagines the computer does not provide the word “circle” because it cannot draw a perfect circle, thereby conveying the meaning and the open possibility of coding.

While Kim recorded his process of coding and showed the video on a 32-inch monitor, Seoul Express made visitors code using images and printed “Hello World!”¹³ The duo completed their coding by only inputting keywords they want into a device, and choosing six images at the end of each stage. These images are uploaded, in real-time, to the Internet, using the various APIs offered by social media platforms, CCTVs in cities across the world, and news outlets. Visitors create a world with different fragmentary images and scenes they select from infinite data and prints “Hello World!” within the parameters of the chosen images’ metadata, related searches, and others filters. The text of “Hello World!” that appears in the visitors’ final product may be interpreted as a metaphor for the process and act of “coding” which is to construct, expand, and face the world. In this way, code is reduced to the construction of a narrative or story. The artsit duo, Seoul Express, pays close attention to the order, combination, and array of digital images, or sets of pixels, that bring about changes in the narrative. To clearly reveal that programming languages are actually the language of “process and procedure,” Seoul Express also uses experimental performances.¹⁴ As Choi Seung Joon asserted, theatre and coding, scenarios and computer programming, resemble each other.¹⁵ If one defines computer programming as “an ordered sequence of computational instructions necessary to achieve a solution” and scenario as “a written outline of a movie, novel, or stage work giving details of the plot, actions, lines, stage setting, and others,” they are very much alike. And as there is unscripted improvisation, there is also an impromptu activity or performance in live coding.

13

When learning to program for the first time, people are often instructed to write a program that outputs the string “Hello World!”

14

See pages 152.

15

Choi Seung Joon, “Construction of Theatrical Coding,” *Code for Love* (Seoul: Seoul Express, 2020), 28.

On the other hand, Unmake Lab found an analogy between code and narrative in the myth of Sisyphus.¹⁶ If this punishment were to be translated into code instructions, it would be broken into two sentences: 1. roll a boulder up; 2. if it rolls down, roll it up again, which comes down to one sentence: “the boulder must always be at the top of the hill.”

The artists thought that this single proposition or restriction would allow many flexible possibilities, such as giving birth to various new stories by destroying and deconstructing the narrative as a result of redefining the concept of the “top” or leveling the top of the hill. This kind of narrative destruction is typically found in artificial intelligence when it becomes unpredictable and out of human expectation. With this methodology Unmake Lab became interested in using artificial intelligence to find a new story outside the human cognitive system. Their single-channel video *Ecosystem* persuasively depicts how this artificial intelligence as a narrative destroyer. As the artists pulled a striped blanket over their heads, and performed various motions, artificial intelligence recognized each of them as different objects such as zebras and cushions. The gap between the visual recognition of the computer and its data value derived from processing input, reveals the values, fixed ideas, prejudices, and exclusions within the unique visual system created by artificial intelligence. The “novel potential” that attracted the artists’ attention to artificial intelligence, in the end, may be something that originates from the algorithmic limitation of computer vision.

Labor and Emotion

“We buy, pay, shop, learn, teach, book, decide, judge, worship, vote, communicate, and dispute online. The online world has absorbed society, economy, politics, culture, religion, and the public sphere. Major offline bases have been crushed after being brought into the online sphere. It is only after we check our choices online that we decide to enter the offline sphere. We go see things offline to confirm the interest they have already produced online. When we feel tired of the online and need a break, we enjoy leisure activities like taking a walk, or a drive. The offline is the parasitic reality of the online.”¹⁷

There exists a screen interfacing between online and offline. Clicking or touching with a finger converts the world into something controllable and then summons it to appear on the screen. Silvio Lorusso and Sebastian Schemiegg’s *Platform Ghosts*, a multisensory installation, realizes this phenomenon in a physical space, whose steel frame and smart glass is a metaphor for the interface between online and offline. The large-scale screen shows the articulated texts depicting more than ten actual episodes of various online workers, such as those unemployed by automation or creators whose accounts were suddenly terminated. The gloomy sound composed by artificial intelligence weighs heavy in the air in the nearly 30 meter square space, maximizing the pain depicted in the imagery. Visitors, who stand in front of the large-scale screen, interface

16

Sisyphus is a figure in an ancient Greek myth, condemned by Zeus for eternity to repeatedly roll a boulder up a hill.

17

Kim Hong Jung, *Reclusive Machine* (Paju: Munhakhongne, 2020), 236-237.

by crossing the space diagonally, reading the monologues of people who exist as ghosts and occasionally perceive them beyond the screen through another visitor standing behind the opaque glass. In this way, *Platform Ghosts* reveals the crowd existing only as ghosts, produced by society in a particular context. This work also notes human beings and their emotions by showing present forms of labor that erase the traces of people by spreading the illusion that high-end technologies, such as mobile applications and artificial intelligence, have been automated. On the other hand, Martin Nadal and César Escudero Andaluz's *BITTERCOIN. The Worst Miner Ever* deals with Bitcoin, an incorporeal crypto-currency. As the title suggests, *BITTERCOIN*, an old calculator machine, works so hard as a miner in the exhibition hall 24 hours a day, yet failed to mine a Bitcoin. The device, designed to print out a nine-centimeter-long receipt every two minutes, created a mountain of paper garbage over four months from the exhibition opening day on July 1 to its end. While wary of resource consumption for creating capital, the artists also presented a video with the calculator to emphasize that the maintenance of decentralized digital currency depends on the open-source community.

Openness and Collaboration

Bleeptrack's *Wikidata Card Game Generator* and Cornelia Sollfrank's *net.art generator* begin with the openness of the online database. They are computer programs that collect and combine materials from the web to create card games and works of net art. For this, Bleeptrack chose Wikipedia, a free Internet encyclopedia, regarded as representative of democratizing knowledge in the age of network-connected computing, that has an editorial system with radical openness. It allows almost anyone from amateurs to experts to edit most of the content and thereby entails two aspects of concern about the risks of vandalism and inaccuracies and strength to correct them quickly. The greatest number or plurality of volunteer editors worldwide reduces regional and cultural biases and guarantees a diversity of topics. For the artists, Wikipedia and its sister projects like Wikidata and Wiktionary are an enormous resource providing various sets of data for statistics, data visualization, and gaming. Wikidata, which acts as central storage for the structured data and can be read and edited by both humans and machines, has become the source of the artists' main creative materials. Similarly, in *net.art generator*, web users become net art creators and their creative products are shared. The code of *net.art generator* has, since 1997, been expanded by collaborations with seven programmers; and this open source code on the project's homepage can be used by anyone.

While living through the pandemic, when safety protocols restricted people's movements, Insook Bae began paying attention to their motions and steps. *Beat Steps*, completed by visitor's steps in the exhibition, is an instrument to measure these steps. Visitors participate

in her work through walking activities, and each of their walking speeds is transformed, through a system devised by the artist, into beats per minute (BPM) data. Bae set her system to the musical genre of K-pop and BPM from 75 to 174, based on easily found information on the web on a list of top 100 K-Pop songs and their BPM data.¹⁸ For example, *Lilac* by singer-songwriter IU has a BPM of 96, and *Cheer Up* by Twice has that of 174. By walking on the 4-meter long passage, visitors summon a K-pop song with the BPM value corresponding to their walking speed results. Because the monitor and speaker play a 10-second preview of each song, the exhibition space reverberated with continually streaming K-pop sounds. This act of collecting economically useless data from visitors at NJP Art Center is a metaphor for how even our steps are converted into data and frequently become personal information leakage. After all, because *Beat Steps* is created by consenting participants, whose walking data is used, the more visitor walks recored, the more data the project collects. At the same, the artist also brings new meaning to movement and meeting by directly asking visitors to walk in the museum that reopened in the pandemic area.

Likewise, MeeNa Park's "Dingbat paintings" are filled by calling out numbers and a set of data. Usually, each dingbat font makes a pair from each key of the QWERTY keyboard. When one chooses a dingbat font and presses the corresponding key, various dingbat symbols and shapes appear instead of letters. The title *11112222222333333333333333333444444555666666777888888999990000* is an array of the numbers the artist input on a QWERTY keyboard. This cryptic title indicates how the artist works: typing dingbats by pressing the number keys from 1 to 9 and rearranging them on another screen, that of the canvas. Because dingbats are included in Unicode, an information technology standard for the consistent encoding and representation of text expressed in most of the world's writing systems, they are compatible in a multilingual environment. Park's paintings are composed of these dingbat images overlapping each other, creating exquisite combinations and harmonizations of different colors. Considering that dingbats can convey individuality and emotions more explicitly than characters, the artist used fourteen acrylic colors in the red area of the color spectrum, suggestive of the emotions such as anger and love. Along with this large-scale painting, a drawing of the same title, consisting of fifty frames, is also displayed in the exhibition. This work, completed with her unique way of coloring and adding doodles to coloring illustration pages, is part of her coloring exercise series that she has been working on since 1998. Her rules include coloring in each page with a single color, except for a heart pattern appearing in every illustration. However, when looking more closely, one will find that these pages are painted rather carelessly. The artist created and applied a new rules, instead of using the existing ones, like coloring inside the lines of the shapes with various colors. While, collecting coloring exercise books and worksheets for more than

twenty years, she has found not only changes in art materials and an increase of various types, but has also found similar illustrations, and noticed changes in gender roles, values, and others social mores, reflected in the images and colors, which are deeply entangled with the ecosystem surrounding coloring exercise illustrations. The artist who has had a long career in art education, uses coloring exercises for children to first learn to write and paint, and in light of ideas of “unlearning,” urges us to reconsider our existing view of the world from a new perspective.

Rewriting

Code needs rewriting over and over again after coding is completed. Even after the exhibition opening, let alone before it, the participating artists’ works were constantly updated. For this, some artists frequently visited the exhibition space, and others did what they needed to do remotely. Seymour Papert thinks that it is by advancing the art of meshing computers with cultures that we can bridge the gulf between the technical-scientific and humanistic cultures. While there have always been attempts to mesh computers and cultures, sometimes, people used technology only as a means, and other times discussed only technology itself. In *Open Codes. Networked Commons*, we intended to talk about the existence of technology: introducing works of art that show the mechanism and meaning behind technology and ask questions about the essence of technology. In this sense, BNAG’s *Play*, placed in the center of the exhibition space, presents an example to invite visitors to find out together, without the computer, what the concept of computing means. The tabletop of *Play*, a real ping-pong table for playing the game, is designed to have many divisions and colors. BNAG’s intention was to confuse the nature of the space by setting the table side by side with works of art, hoping that visitors would feel like playing ping-pong in the museum. Furthermore, BNAG even encourages them to create and execute new rules on the surface of this ping pong table with abstract color fields. Now, players can infinitely increase the number of ways of playing the game by adding new ones to the previous ones under the existing rules, according to players’ different experiences and preferences. The only proposition that matters here is *Play*. In this exhibition space designed to foster coding-based artistic creation, learning, and discussion, visitors become a significant network in forming the exhibition. They may close their eyes and rest or stand up after only reading a book on the sofa.

“The term “museum” means a facility established to collect, manage, preserve, survey, research, exhibit, and educate material related to arts, such as paintings, calligraphic works, sculptures, handicraft, architectural works, and photographs,

among museums, in order to contribute to developing, culture and arts; enhancing the general public's enjoyment of culture; and facilitating lifelong education."19 This is the definition of a museum provided by the Museum and Art Gallery Support Act, Korea. Even though we do not immediately translate it into an imaginary coding language following SeungBum Kim's work, the definition should be reexamined. Finally, we would like to mention the artist's insight of finding the essence of rewriting in the meaning of "tinker": "to tinker (with something) to make small changes to something in order to repair or improve it, especially in a way that may have no useful effect." He pays attention to the phrase "especially in a way that may have no useful effect."20 Tinkering seems to have some resonance with the role of art and museums. By repeating the rewriting and implementing the words, from those in the definition of a museum to those of big and small events happening in museums, the museum would be able to move toward a new stage, if not helpful right away.

19
MUSEUM AND ART
GALLERY SUPPORT
ACT, Statutes of the
Republic of Korea

20
https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/definition/english/tinker_2?q=tinkering