

“Anything Goes” and “Creating New Knowledge” – about Doctoral Degrees in Fine Arts for Hong Kong.

Frank Vigneron

Teaching art when art is everywhere, what happens in art education when “anything goes” ?¹

In the context of higher art education, the knowledge of the developments in art making over the last fifty years, and in remarkably vast geographical and cultural areas, has allowed students in fine arts departments to experiment in directions that are so varied that they have become nearly impossible to map efficiently when it comes to grading. Although it is not often acknowledged, as we always like to believe that what happens in the studios and classrooms of art departments is already art, but there is a real difference between a professional art practice and an educational art practice. The most visible difference is made explicit at the end of the semester when studio art teachers have to grade their students' works. How can one grade an artwork, when all the old criteria of aesthetic quality – like composition, colour, etc. – are increasingly often irrelevant in an evaluation?

I am not a studio art teacher and, in spite of the kindness of my colleagues who are not opposed to me giving an opinion on the work of our students, I am not involved in the marking process of students' works in the studio. I understand that it is possible to teach art making without any art history courses (or with just the bare minimum, which is to say almost nothing), but it is my opinion that studio art and art history are living together in a marriage of convenience, but that this arranged marriage is also the proverbial “match made in heaven.” My job description is that I teach “courses on the History of Western Art, the theories of Modernism and Postmodernism, and on Chinese and Western Comparative Aesthetics.” And, of course, that is what I do – the description was in fact provided by me. But there might be some misunderstandings on what is meant by History of Western Art.

As far as I am concerned, it is not really “Western art history” fine arts students have to study. Although it is not possible to do so as it would not only require far too many hours of lecturing but also many more lecturers than it is possible to hire; ideally, the study of art history in the context of a studio art course should be about how art is being made around the world today.² Of course, in the Fine Arts Department of the Chinese University of Hong Kong, we still study European and Chinese art and its theory at least from the 15th to the 21st century, but in my mind the knowledge of this history is only a preparation to better understand contemporary art. Whether they specialize in studio art or art history, our students are all part of this world and the only thing we can do to make them understand it better is to provide them with knowledge of the past, or at least facilitate their access to that vast reserve of information, and in fact, an understanding of the present or the future is something they can only do for themselves.³

¹ Parts of this section have been presented as a paper, titled “Studio Art and Art History: a Marriage of Convenience?” at the conference *Teaching Art when Art is Everywhere. Art Education in Hong Kong*, 18 May 2007.

² Some of the questions related to the possibility of teaching a ‘World Art History,’ a project attempted by professor David Summers in *Real Spaces: World Art History and the Rise of Western Modernism* (London: Phaidon, 2003), have been treated in *Is Art History Global?* Edited by James Elkins. (London and New York: Routledge, 2006), p. 322-341.

³ I have also treated briefly some of the concepts describing what is needed in contemporary higher education in art in a paper presented during a conference (“Opportunities and Challenges – Conference on Visual Arts Education in Asia,” 23-25 June 2010. Organized by the Academy of Visual Arts, the Baptist University of Hong Kong) and titled “Some Useful Concepts From the Past and the Present: Teachable and Unteachable Notions for Higher Education in Art.” In his reflections for the demands of a new system of higher education in art, Thierry de Duve relied on his own definition of what past institutions created to produce a possible new system, more adequate for our times of changing definitions of art. After giving a portrait of art education in both the old academies of the past and the more recent approach of the Bauhaus, Thierry de Duve analyzed the contradictions between these two systems while noticing that both are still very much alive in today's art education institutions, a situation that produces more problems than solutions. He then devised his own trilogy of concepts, an attempt to resolve these contradictions into a more open system: attitude, practice, and deconstruction. But even he had to admit that this solution is lacking on several points to address the demand of a truly contemporary form of art education. This paper delivered a new trilogy, proposed recently by Frances Whitehead (art professor at the School of Art Institute of Chicago): Métis, Praxis, and redirection. Although praxis and redirection are useful concepts, they are however not so far removed from de Duve's solution and simply state more efficiently the demands of higher education in art. It is, more importantly, the idea of Métis – or “cunning intelligence” – that was addressed as both an extraordinarily rich concept in contemporary art making and a truly problematic one when it comes to art education. In conclusion, since “cunning intelligence” cannot be taught, it was proposed that the best way to put students in situations where they would have to produce such an attitude would be to allow for more mobility and let them

Similarly, since contemporary art is now made in a truly globalized context, the old “East” versus “West” dichotomy cannot be accepted anymore. When we have to understand how Chinese artists are working in today’s world for instance, it has become necessary to understand their art in a globalized context. In that sense, calling what I do art history might not be a good idea when it comes to teaching recent developments in the arts of Euro-America and China (Europe, North America and China are my only concern because I cannot claim to work on “global” or “world” art history). What I do is related to written theory and the understanding of the contexts of production of contemporary art, a discipline much closer to what is being taught and studied in “cultural studies” department. But it is in these domains of ideas that it is possible to find a more adequate way to assess students’ artworks.

There are, however, still some domains that do not need really different systems of evaluation. In the teaching and assessment of traditional Chinese painting and calligraphy, for instance, there are still objective criteria to evaluate the quality of an artwork and these criteria have to rely on a real knowledge of the paintings and the calligraphies of the past. In the context of the practice of Chinese painting and calligraphy art history is not, and has never been considered as, an external appendage to studio art. But it is for the more “contemporary” forms of art, forms that are not made with paint and sometimes even without any object, that the problem of assessment is the most acute.

These art forms are literally the domains where the expression coined by Paul Feyerabend (1924-1994) is the *modus operandi*: “anything goes.” The American philosopher came up with this notion in his celebrated 1975 book *Against Method: Outline of an Anarchistic Theory of Knowledge*,⁴ where he explained a way to understand the multitude of specialized knowledge which appeared in the modern world. According to Feyerabend, who showed that no interesting theory is ever consistent with *all* the relevant facts, new theories get to be accepted not because of their respect for scientific method, but because their supporters use different kinds of tricks to prove that they are entirely right – whereas, in reality, they can only be partly and provisionally right. It is in this floating domain of knowledge without fixed ideology, and contemporary art is such a domain, that the only way to make things change and evolve is to create systems of ideas and concepts where “anything goes”.

Since “anything goes” nowadays in the art world, there is a real difficulty in the assessment of contemporary artworks. Since everything is acceptable and nothing can be assessed according to criteria of “quality”, there is always the danger to impose on the students personal values like taste, this central and problematic concept of 18th century aesthetics. The problem lies in the old Kantian tradition of considering that a judgment of taste, which is supposed to be disinterested, still tends and pretends to be universal in spite of the variety of personal tastes: in that conception of what is considered good in an academic context, the actual criteria of judgment is in reality shaped by cultural and social background and therefore cannot apply to every artwork without creating hierarchies that are never objective (and that context will vary with time and place: what is good today in Hong Kong might not be so in the future and was certainly not good in the past). That has been the problems of art schools in the 20th century: since social and cultural structures change all the time, the basis of judgment and assessment, i.e. the personal taste of the teachers, tend to become obsolete very quickly.

This problem was already treated by David Hume in his text titled *Of the Standard of Taste* in 1757.⁵ For him, the best way to acquire the “true criteria of taste” is practice. Through practice, i.e. listening or viewing and comparing, with patience and care, everyone should be able, using common sense, to recognize true beauty. Of course, the idea of beauty itself is not an essential concept of contemporary art, but it could be replaced with the “anything” of “anything goes”, i.e. any concept the students would like to express in their artworks. This is why formulating this concept in a text or a conversation becomes an essential part of the work of the students and of the assessment of the artwork. As far as I am concerned, the only way to make the assessment of an artwork in an academic context is to compare the artwork with the discourse developed by the artist and see if they fit. Obviously, there is still a great deal of personal judgment involved in that kind of assessment, but at least it goes further than an initial “gut reaction” to the artwork.

No matter how much teachers believe they are “in touch with the times”, younger students might have tastes, values and criteria radically different from theirs but no less entirely justified. Because teachers doing the assessment come from different backgrounds, they are also always in danger to be blind to the validity of their students criteria (but this is also true doing critique sessions in studio classes, during which other students practice a kind of assessment of their peers’ works: everyone is different and everyone can claim that their cultural and social values are justified and acceptable). In that context, even the solution of peer assessment cannot be entirely valid, although it remains an excellent way to multiply the points of view in the assessment of an artwork and therefore attain a certain level of objectivity in grading.

study in various art schools around the world, thus enriching their own experience through unexpected situations.

⁴ Feyerabend, Paul: *Against Method: Outline of An Anarchistic Theory of Knowledge* (London, New York: Verso Books, 1993).

⁵ Hume, David: “Of the Standard of Taste”, in *Art and Its Significance: an anthology of Aesthetic Theory*, Ross, Stephen David (ed.) (Albany: State University of New York Press, c. 1994.), p. 78-92.

In any case, the final decision still belongs to the teacher – maybe this can be regretted, but it remains the most practical solution. That is where “art history”, or rather a knowledge of theory and how to put into words the ideas that eventually came into the creation of the artwork, becomes handy. The better students are capable of explaining what they have been trying to do in the making of the artwork, the more likely they will make the artwork acceptable to the assessing authority: it is simply a question of winning over your audience. In these conditions, artists create their own criteria for judging the artwork and do not have to rely exclusively on the culture and taste of the teacher.

I would like to insist on the fact that I am only talking about art education and assessment in a higher education context; to require secondary school art students to be able to articulate in writing the concepts behind their artworks would be asking too much. I personally believe that secondary school art education can afford to require the students to learn the criteria of forms of art which can be assessed on simple formal requirements (colour, composition, etc.). Similarly, I am not talking about art practitioners in general who do not need to justify their artworks in theory because no one is really grading them, although I am always tempted to appreciate better artists who are also capable of articulating their visual concepts in writing. I am perfectly aware that legions of wonderful artists have made their artworks without ever thinking of them in terms of ideas and words. Such a use of theory is only necessary in a higher education environment to ensure a greater level of accuracy in the assessment of the artwork and the validity of the student’s aesthetic endeavor.

But in the end, this is no ideal solution either, because judging whether the discourse about an artwork really fits the artwork also relies heavily on questions of personal taste and, even more importantly, personal culture. Even David Hume believed that persons capable of judging the “true criteria of beauty” by abandoning all their prejudices were extremely rare and that, in fact, he had never met anyone capable of doing so. Unfortunately, no teacher will ever be able to read and know everything and, in this world where information is available everywhere, even our younger students will know things we have absolutely no knowledge of. All the more reason to let students convince the teachers of the validity of their work; as teachers, our duty is to listen and be as devoid of prejudices as is humanly possible.

The sort of training required to be able to simply “explain” the artwork will probably seem unnecessary to many studio art teachers who prefer the idea that the visual (or tactile, or whatever bodily function that does not rely on language) is what matters and that any verbalization of the ideas present in the work makes the work poorer. That kind of art practices exist and they are perfectly valid, but it remains that many other art practices require explanation to be understood. I have in mind the work of one of the Fine Arts department student who graduated in 2010, Yeung Shing-him Bernard : made for an exhibition related to stories from the *Liaozhai Zhiyi* by Pu Songling (1640-1715), it represents a mountain with some human figures inscribed with pencils on it [Illustration 1].⁶ However, if the spectator does not know which story it refers to and that the shape of the mountain is that of the Hang Seng index on a specific day, the content of the work would elude even the most cultivated viewer. That explanation does not make the work poorer, on the contrary, it makes it more interesting and does not take away any of its “aesthetic” qualities. The need for training in “verbalizing” is also something that requires years of practice to reach the sort of level required to be taken seriously as an artist by the best publications and journals on contemporary art. And if that training needs to be initiated at the level of undergraduate studies, it is something that needs to be refined through other levels of art education.

PhD in Art and/or DFA: the problem of knowledge for/through/in art.

If the “anything goes” allows for more freedom in any art practice, it also demands much more reflection. In fact, the freer the art expression and the more likely it is to require a very solid theoretical foundation. In that sense, the MFA can get students to the extreme of experimentation, where freedom and individuality are working together to shape an original art practice, but it is with the DFA or PhD in art – let’s leave the discussion about their differences for later – that the art practitioner will be given the opportunity to reflect more profoundly, with text and research, on their art practices. There are several ways to do so, and it is in the papers of Christopher Frayling (after Herbert Read in 1944), former rector of the Royal College of Art and chairman of the Arts Council England (but certainly more famous for his research in popular culture), that we found a formulation of these three ways to approach this ultimate postgraduate degree. According to him, there are three kinds of research possible in a doctoral degree in fine arts:

The first kind is what he calls “research into the arts”:

⁶ Artist statement: “This piece began with the classic Song Dynasty painting *Travelers Among Mountains and Streams* by Fan Kuan and the *Liaozhai* story (*The Rakshasas and the Ocean Bazaar*). This story sends readers a message that wealth and pride should be found in fantasy. The ridge of *Mount HSI* reflects the brief rise and fall of the Hang Seng Index from 1984 to early 2010. Throughout decades, so many Hong Kong people tried to climb that dangerous mount. Few stopped before the point of no return and even fewer reached the peak. How many people among those successful climbers have found themselves satisfied and came down safely?”

The first category seemed to me straightforward, whether it happens to originate in the studio or in the library: research into the arts. According to the available indices and my own experience, this is still by far the most visible form of research in our worlds. That is, research via a variety of perspectives: social, historical, economic, cultural, psychological, technical or whatever. There are countless models, and archives, from which to derive its rules and procedures, and where many traditional universities are concerned, this is probably the only kind of research there is.⁷

There is already a clear division here and, in Hong Kong, that sort of research would immediately be identified as an “art history” research. It therefore does not need to occupy us here. The second category is what he calls “research through the arts”:

The second category accounts for the next largest number of entries on the indices, and is slightly less straightforward but still visible and identifiable: research through the arts. It could take the form of materials research, or development/craft work of some kind, or customizing a piece of technology, or action research provided it is documented properly, or making a film or video and deriving new knowledge and/or understanding through the process, provided it is communicable knowledge. Medical, anatomical, psychological, pedagogical – whatever – through the arts. The research is looking for something, and it looks for it through the arts. My favorite example, which was based at the Royal College of Art and the Central School, is Michael Rowe’s now-published research into the colourization, patination and texturing of metals. It was presented in the form of a whole series of replicable experiments, and examples of the wonderful things which could be made out of the results – for me, a classic example of research through art and design. When such work shades into materials science, or electronics, or engineering, then there are – again – countless models and archives to choose from. But it doesn’t always do that, nor should it.⁸

I believe that sort of research is more clearly the domain of design education institutions. When it is obvious that the limits between art and design are very often extremely difficult to identify, it remains I think quite clear (but I also realize that many teachers will disagree with me) that art education and design education are two very different things even though they do share some common ground. This type of research can therefore very well take place in art education institution, but I do not think they are very likely to happen very often, this is the reason why I also believe we should not be concerned with this second type of art research. The third category, and the only one I would retain for a possible doctoral degree in Hong Kong, is the one Christopher Frayling called “research for the arts”, or “the arts as research”:

The third category is still by far the most contentious: that is, research for the arts, or the arts as research. Research where the end product is an artifact or a performance or where the thinking is, so to speak, embodied in the artifact, or where the goal is not primarily communicable knowledge in the sense of verbal communication at all, but in the sense of visual or musical or physical communication or product semantics or the experience of the moving image. In some ways, the RAE [Research Assessment Exercise] documents get around the problem by listing a series of outcomes, discipline by studio discipline, and leaving it at that. But their concern, as we’ve seen, is mainly with the results of research whereas at this conference we’re equally concerned with its processes.⁹

The debate about a doctoral degree in art has revolved around two problems: first, the idea that it would become the terminal degree in art, a place occupied until now by the Master of Fine Arts; second, the idea that a doctoral degree should create new knowledge, the requirement expected by every other academic discipline (although never too clearly defined as one would expect all these different domains to rely on different understandings of what “knowledge” means). We will first try to elucidate the position of the doctoral degree in art when compared to the expectations of the MFA.

To start with the first step towards these degrees, we have to make clear that the Bachelor of Fine Arts is a degree where people learn about art in the widest possible sense of the word (its history, some techniques – although this is already a contentious subject – and some of the theory that accompanied its practice over the centuries). A number of the graduates will already have more than enough training to undertake any kind of professional art activities, from teaching to professional art practice, but any development of these capacities will take place in the “real world” without the assistance of an educational institution. The purpose of a doctoral degree in art is NOT to educate people to be artists, in many ways (and if it is possible), that is the purpose of the MFA, but to educate artists to be active in an academic environment: to be able to support what they do as artists with the adequate use of what we can call “theory”.

For the MFA, candidates will actually prove their capacity to become professional artists by applying into their art practices an already high degree of theorization. It is where their ideas actually take more professional shapes –

⁷ Frayling, Christopher: “Research in and Through the Arts: What’s the Problem?”, paper delivered during a conference at the Guildhall School, London, in 2009.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid.

professionalism being the key word here – and they are given what they need to know how to function in a world of art institutions and in the art market. The MFA is, in a sense, a quicker way to master what would be learnt in the “real world.” It is also a space where artists can receive an extremely high degree of professionalization, preparing them to work in positions of higher responsibility in the “art world” (art market, art administration, etc.). It is also a space where artists are asked to provide their first professional reflection on their own art practices and their positions in the contemporary art scene, a reflection that will be sanctioned by a postgraduate degree (when MFA candidates, during their first presentations in a seminar, mention the fact that they never really put into words what they were trying to do in their art practice, they are reminded that they are postgraduate students working to obtain a higher degree; in that context the artwork and its theorization become the only possible way to assess students in order to grant them this high qualification). In the MFA however, the degree of specialization remains at the level of a professional practice, if there is already a high degree of reflection, that reflection is still not deepened to the level of what would be the terminal degree in higher education in art.

It is however important not to “devalue” the MFA, for people wishing to get the basis, theoretical and practical, to become a professional artist, it is still the terminal degree. A doctoral degree in art has therefore to be something else and that something else might as well be defined starting with what has been the main issue with the idea of a doctorate in art especially in the US: the idea that a doctorate thesis has to produce new knowledge (and, of course, a lot of people doubting that art making can be tantamount to the production of knowledge since this notion came from science where the understanding of what is knowledge is necessarily, and rightly so, very narrowly defined). Let’s take the problem from the other end: the doctoral degree in art would precisely be the *topos* where practicing artists, with an MFA, establish that their art practice is the creation of new knowledge, a place where the “anything goes” gets formulated in words by situating the art practice within an art historical framework and substantiating it with the appropriate theoretical basis.

The DFA or PhD in ‘Fine arts’ is a degree where professional artists become “academics” (not necessarily in order to become one though, but more to become someone with the same rigor in self-analysis and understanding of their art practice’s position within the contemporary art world), in that sense their research is not limited to what they do for the gallery but also include new ways to deal with the issues they raised with the artworks: in so many words, they become theorists and in that sense they produce new knowledge. In fact, the main purpose of this degree is precisely to establish new knowledge even though that ambition is extremely difficult to define in the context of a research university. This degree is not designed to become a vocational education for professional artists, this is the purpose of the MFA. It is designed for those who want to pursue a more “theoretical” direction in their art practices.

One example of the sort of art research that could be seen as “creating new knowledge.”

The “could be” of the title of this sub-section is there because it is still extremely difficult to convince the people in charge of validating higher education degrees that anything in creative arts (and this includes such domains as creative writings or music) has anything to do with knowledge since the definition of knowledge considered here is generally the one defined for scientific activities. It would take us far too much time to deal with these sometimes contradictory notions here and I will simply assume that whatever kind of clarification of any kind of situation can be considered to be knowledge (a sociological analysis of any given human situation for instance is seen as new knowledge and worthy of being researched in the context of a doctoral degree, although it does not create anything new in the “real world”). As much as I truly appreciate his art practice, I chose the artworks of the architect Tim Li mostly because I recently reviewed it as an external examiner for his Doctorate of Fine Arts with the Royal Melbourne Institute of Technology University, a degree he obtained in 2010. I believe it qualifies as an example of the sort of reflection led on a art practice that constitutes what should be called new knowledge in the context of fine arts.

In addition to the art making itself, Tim Li also managed to publish a book on this project, the illustrations accompanying the following were all taken from this elegant publication¹⁰. Taking a certain type of folding bed as the core of his art practice, Tim Li used this object to reflect on the concept of public space in Hong Kong. Starting from a historical perspective – explaining how the folding bed became the standard measure of public housing in Hong Kong – Tim Li exploited the folding bed in a series of performances involving the inhabitants of very specific areas of Hong Kong. Tim Li’s use of public space as well as the bed as signifier of private space makes of his work just as much a reflection on cultural identity as a series of considerations on the general opposition of the public and the private in a modern city.

In the section called “The debate,” Tim Li interviewed several personalities involved in art making and also policy making, with a concern for the notion of public art. Out of these interviews, we are left with a solid understanding of the possibilities of an artist’s intervention in the public space in Hong Kong where that issue has generated quite a number of debates over the last few years. From policemen questioning Kith Tsang (born 1959) eating a bowl of rice in the street to the distribution of “open-space” shaped cookies by Warren Leung 梁志和 (born 1968) all the way through Freeman Lau’s (born 1958) use of the chair as a floating signifier in Hong Kong culture, it is the question of what is allowed and what is not allowed in public spaces that Tim Li also wants to consider with his object, the bed (which can be seen as the

¹⁰ Tim Li: *Dialogue with the Bed*, (Hong Kong: HULU Concept Limited, 2009)

ultimate representation of intimacy although it does not really takes on that definition in his work; Tim Li concludes the first section of his paper with an interesting comment on the nylon bed as “homeless, but... always... in our home.”), as well as with his public performances. In that sense, his work covers the whole gamut of contemporary art practices, from political and administrative considerations to aesthetic ones as well as the concepts more specifically involved in the questions of performance and its relationship with the art object.

Chapter 4, titled “The experiments,” describes all the performances Tim Li organized around the notions of public and private space in Hong Kong. Well-researched (with references to artists like Barbara Hoffman and even the 1924 Surrealist Manifesto) and described in abundant details, it forms the core of his research and never disappoints. Tim Li used several iconic places in Hong Kong to explore his notions, places famous for their super-dense urban development and therefore perfectly adapted to his questioning about how the private can carve a niche of its own in such environments. From the super-populated and popular area of Mong Kok on the Kowloon peninsula [Illustration 2], to the more urbane but nonetheless just as much populated area of Time Square on Hong Kong Island [Illustration 3], Tim Li made a choice of very varied *loci* to locate and play with his folding beds.

As an architect working for the Hong Kong Housing Authority, Tim Li has had ample opportunities to work with a number of institutions dealing with some of the issues treated in this research. His responsibility during the Venice Biennale Architecture in 2006 was particularly important for him in researching and thinking about his art projects. Other places in Hong Kong were therefore also a space of exploration for Tim Li, and he for instance used the Central Police Station/Victoria Prison compound for one of his installations [Illustration 4], a particularly interesting space because it still is today in Hong Kong one of the buildings that risked annihilation in the context of a society that, until recently, did not show much interest in preserving its past. Tim Li also explored that change of attitude of Hong Kong society by questioning the mindless destruction of the past that has been the rule until the public demonstrations of the last few years, when a large portion of the population (and, most visibly, the so-called ‘post-80’ generation) demanded their collective memory to be preserved. The most ambitious of these performances took place in Central, in the space underneath the Hong Kong and Shanghai Bank, a perfect example of how private enterprises have far too often “stolen” public spaces from the Hong Kong public to forcibly, and illegally, turn them into corporate-owned spaces [Illustration 5] [Illustration 6].

In his conclusion, Tim Li answers clearly the research questions he gave at the beginning of his exegesis. His ambitious project of performances, involving large numbers of people, are straightforward explorations of the issues of public and private space in a dense urban area: very clear in its development but extremely rich in meaning, Tim Li relied as much on his knowledge of the history of Hong Kong as on his thoughtful approach as an architect to develop a body of work that not only brings new knowledge to the field of public art but is also entirely satisfying as an art project in an aesthetic and relational sense. The fact that he succeeded in producing these works and showcased them in a beautifully designed book is another manifestation of the fact that his reflection – with its use of readymade in the form of metal-framed nylon beds, the social commentary it produced in the context of “relational aesthetics” as well as the analysis that accompanies them – not only succeeded in producing new knowledge but made it transparently explicit through different means ranging from historical descriptions to the interviews conducted by the artist while producing the various levels of his art practice.

[Illustration 1]

Yeung Shing Him Bernard, *Mount HIS*, wood, iron and paint, 10cm x 18cm x 130cm, 2010.

[Illustration 2]

Tim Li, *Lodgment in Space, Nathan*, Nathan Road , Mong Kok, 21-11-2008, 16:44:51.

[Illustration 3]

Tim Li, *Lodgment in Space*, “Time and Square”, Times Square
Clock Tower, Causeway Bay, 25-11-2008, 22:55:40.

[Illustration 4]

Tim Li, *All together*, “Unfolding the Possible VI – Central Police Station /
Victoria Prison Compound” (January to March 2008).

[Illustration 5]

Tim Li, *All together*, “Unfolding the Possible VIII – Dance with Lions”
(April 2009) .

[Illustration 6]

Tim Li, *All together*, “Unfolding the Possible VIII – Dance with Lions”
(April 2009).