

26th ifva Media Art Category Jury Meeting Transcript

Jury Members : Bryan Chung (Chung), Tamás Waliczky (Tamas), Samson Young (Young), Sarah Lee (Lee), Wang Jun-Jieh (Wang)

Organizer representatives : Kattie Fan (Fan)

Fan: We have to use the documentation and applications that the finalists submitted to justify if they are good enough to get awards. At the same time, we have just set up the artworks in the gallery. For one of the artworks, *Awakening*, from Taiwan, because it is site specific, she couldn't make the real artwork in our gallery. Instead, she has shown us the video documentation. For *Spectrum*, no artwork and no documentation is in our gallery for now, because she failed to give us any video documentations, and we only have a few panels to show her artwork, which is quite difficult for the audience to comprehend. At the end, we decided to take out her work from the exhibition. For the competition, you can still assess her work from the documentation that you have. The information I have just told you is a reference for your judgement, because the visibility of the artwork is quite important too. We usually want the jury to see the artwork for real in our gallery, but at this time we have a lot of limitations. Do you have any questions?

Lee: The awards include Gold, Silver and Special Mention. There is also an award for Hong Kong, is that also another award?

Fan: This award entitles the winner to a festival visit, and that is a prize for the Hong Kong division. For example, let's say the Silver Award is a Hong Kong work, then the artist will also be entitled to have this festival visit award. If there no further questions, we will begin. I suggest we go through each artwork one by one. I have also shown you the comments that everyone has submitted, and we can briefly discuss each artwork based on these comments. After that, we can nominate the award winners. May I invite our long-term juror, Bryan, to begin first?

Chung: The first one, *Aesthetics and Freedom of Human Beings*, is an immersive installation that need to lock you inside. I haven't yet considered the environment because it needs a control interface, so it seems to be a primitive way (and not well designed) for the audience to interact. I understand the artist is using motion sensing camera to make sense of the motion of the audience, but the touchscreen is not my cup of tea as it has a midi performance controller.

Tamas: From what I can see of the video presentation and the description, it seems it's a nicely made interactive installation. But for me, the fact that the viewer is locked into an environment for 20 minutes, it's not nice. I personally don't like such situations where I'm locked in anywhere. In the description, the artist speaks about freedom, and in this situation where I am locked is the opposite of freedom. I don't understand

why it is necessary to be locked down.

Lee: I would agree with Tamas. This work is graphically compelling, but it's difficult to engage, although I'm limited by not being able to experience the work in person. Because of the nature of what's been submitted, we almost experience it from how the artist wants us to view the work, we're limited by their perspective. With this work, it's difficult to feel what freedom the viewer may experience, because the artist specifies 31 minutes, which is a very specific time, and I am wondering if people would sit with that work for that long. The experience is a little bit difficult in person.

Wang: I agree with the comments. For me, the concept is very interesting. The artist uses many text messages. For the audience, it's hard to understand the idea of the work, which is not completely transformed into the metaphor for a media installation. It's difficult for the audience.

Young: I think the restriction of movement and the work's intended comment on freedom, I think that contradiction is probably intended. The experience itself, from what I was able to see, didn't really transform or lift the text beyond the idea of that contradiction. When we first discussed this, we kind of understand how it's going to work together, and when we saw the further documentation it looked exactly like how we'd imagine it, but it kind of stopped there as well. That's how I felt about the work.

Fan: Let's move on to the next work, *Awakening*.

Chung: For this work, I know of the artist because of my position as juror last year. This work is difficult to judge without being there because of the site-specific nature. Actually, I quite like this piece of work because it makes use of the idea of augmented reality but tries not to do some common thing related to it. Everything you see inside; you look through the windows and echoed back through the screen of the iPad monitor. There's an artificial branch from a tree that knocks on the window, then you realize they're different. I like this meditative idea or this kind of awakening. Usually in our everyday lives, we have this kind of experience, we are in a situation or physical space, but our mind is somewhere else, until there is some sudden knock on our body or sound that we hear that we can come back to the present moment. I buy this particular idea. It's a pity that I can't experience whether this is the case in a physical environment. There are some things the artist can improve, like the position of the iPad or the size of the screen in comparison with the real window, whether it is the ideal way to put the iPad, on the same level as the real window or if it is better to use a bigger screen. Personally, I enjoyed this piece of work, but because it is site specific, it is quite difficult to comment at this moment.

Tamas: Unfortunately, I couldn't watch this work as an installation, so I don't know how it looks in real life. As I watched the video documentation, for me there were lots of questions. I couldn't see any 3-D scanning, AR or 3-D models in this work. Maybe there are in

the background, but what I saw was an iPad which shows reality, and sometimes there is a noise that makes some visual effect to distort the image. It seems to me not enough compared to the description. The idea in the description is very interesting, the theoretical background seems very interesting, but the work that I saw on the video, I could not get how all the elements works. Maybe everything is hidden in this minimalist work, but for me, it's very hard to judge based on the video.

Lee: It's a very subtle work, and It is quite intriguing in terms of the presentation of the real world and the 3-D world. I'd like to see how she pushes the 3-D further in terms of the technology available. I'd be interesting to see how it will be presented in the context of the exhibition. Rather than looking at it through an iPad, the entire external relationship is very important. If it was presented at the HKAC terrace, the real world experience may be a very interesting take on that.

Wang: This is a site-specific work which is quite minimal to show the context with the real environment. The problem is how to fit the installation form in a space, for example in Hong Kong. I think it's form and intention are not well connected.

Young: This is not a work that is easy to translate. In order to judge it we have to see how it translates in reality. A second issue is a lot of the experience of the work is about the scale of things, when you walk in the space, you see the digital rendering and the knocking and how loud and often it is. All of those things are difficult to judge, because it's a simple work in terms of the physical elements in combination. That's something for us to consider, that this is an unusual situation that we are dealing with in terms of judging the quality of the works.

Chung: About what Tamas has raised, I can only speculate. In the documentation there is no mention about those technical rendering of the 3D scanning. I speculate that the iPad image is a 3D reconstruction of the scene outdoor, which looks as real as possible until it's being disturbed by the knocking. This is what I imagine will be the intention of the illusion generated by augmented reality.

Fan: The next one is *Give No Words but Mum*.

Chung: I have gone through the materials and I have more understanding about what the artist intends to do with plants. It is something like a narrative work using video installation as a way to contain everything. The interaction part is actually quite minimal, in the sense there's some kind of touching of tin foil and then switching to another video. They may not be very successful and awkward in the sense that you have the Arduino and tin foil visible in the sensation of the earth and plant and this kind of natural environment. The work has very good image quality, and the idea of some kind of engagement and exchange between human beings and ecology of the plant.

Tamas: For me, the video is one of the most interesting works in this competition. I like its surreal world and irony and the interaction with the plants. I'm not sure if I understand 100% of what happened there, but I guess the same thing as what Bryan said. It's a simple interaction, you just touch it and the video changes. For me, it a little bit contradictory because as an interactive work it's very simple, but the image quality of the video is very nice. Personally, I like those works which has a certain irony in it, that's why I like the video.

Lee: I found I quite enjoyed the narrative approach to the work, I find it quite humorous. It plays with the relationship with nature and domestic environment, and the way we can get obsessed with our relationship with plants. The mixture of physical and digital in telling the narrative was enjoyable. As an installation, it could have worked on the idea of senses, because you've got nature in a space. That would have added another dimension to the work. Overall, it left quite a strong impression, I enjoyed the narrative quality to the work.

Wang: I liked this work also, it speaks to the poetic form of humans and plants and explores the relationship between politics, power and class. But I think the installation form is quite a problem for this work. The design of the exhibition place is to be improved.

Young: I like the idea of this work a lot. It links the objects together with a video, but at a rather linear relationship. Other jurors may have more insight, but my sense is that ifva encourages certain critical engagement with the use of these technologies. That's my only reservation, but I liked this work a lot.

Fan: From our definition of media arts, it is quite broad. Four or five years ago we had a Gold Award winner which is a purely video installation. It's up to the jurors to decide the awards. We can move on to the next one, *Living to Die*.

Chung: I also enjoyed this work. As I pointed out in the comments, it is a missing point that I'm not quite sure what they are about. The use of websites that the installation is trying to retrieve in order to generate the images from the notion of death and the location. Because the choice of those website would determine what kind of geographical location that the piece of work will traverse or navigate, there's some kind of missing hint from the artist. I also like the idea of using the geographical location and the text of those images and put them together to form a visual narrative by using a word like "death" in this case.

Tamas: I also like the concept, and I think it's a professional and nicely made work. My only concern was exactly what Bryan said, that the geographical locations and images that the artist uses from those locations, the images seem to me quite trivial and simple, and therefore, my feeling when I watch this work was, that is not about death, it's more about travelling and distance. And in this way, this work loses an important layer and starts to become quite illustrative. It's not deep or serious enough. That's my

personal feeling.

- Lee: I enjoyed this work from a visual narrative aspect. It's quite a typical idea right now, about a journey, and the journey is the data, and going from one place to another is quite a nice idea. The soundtrack has quite a nice sensitivity. It'd be interesting to see it as a larger scale installation instead of multiple devices, what would happen in a large scale and in a more immersive setting rather than rows of screens. The content would have been more important to understand. The title sounds quite ominous, but the idea of rebirth or journey or going to some place or destination might have been a bit more positive.
- Wang: I like this work very much. The work is quite a direct expression of technology art. It's a very good idea to use transmission and termination of digital signal to metaphorize life and death. I think it's a good idea to use the screens and tie them with life and death.
- Young: I'm a little bit on the fence with this work. There are some nice elements in it, but there are also aspects of it that I felt are illustrative. This is a work that would benefit from being seen in person. If there can be a layer of extra commentary or contradiction in the way of the very simple input and output with each other, like do they line up or do they mix up and jumble when all of the screens are seen together? I think some of those details are difficult to capture in this sort of documentation, and judging the documentation is difficult for me.
- Fan: It is a big challenge for all of you to judge the artworks based on the documentations. Even for us and the artists it is a big challenge at this time to set up the work, but still, we have to try to go through them. The next work is *Modern Body*.
- Chung: The second series of documentation contains a lot more information than the first. I like this work, it is simple and straight-forward, related to the deformed use of facial images in a huge projection and making use of the idea of the scale of the individual parts of the facial features, projected in huge scale against the wall. It is awkward and interesting. For the motion, I'm not sure if there is any logic about how the animation is constructed, and I'm not sure about this type of Flash algorithmic or generative process. It reminds me of some of the early days of the fresh animation of the net art period, when people played around with these kinds of images on the screen rather than the installation environment.
- Tamas: I like this piece, I think it's funny and visually interesting. I like this kind of optical distortions and illusions. I also found the second part of the material very interesting. If I understand well, in the first part, there is only one work, this face distorted in bubbles, and in the second part, it turns out there is a series of different ways of presenting a human face. I found this very interesting, and I hope the artist would exhibit more of these works. It'd be interesting to see these different possibilities of

how he can visualize a human face. But even if it was just the first work, even if he just wants to show that one, I think it's an interesting work.

Lee: To see the work as part of a larger body of work would be quite interesting. I found the visual presentation quite nice, it's quite sensitive and enjoyable to watch the bubbles, the soundtrack and the overlay with the highly digital photograph which emerge and disappear. It's quite an emotional work, perhaps. Today, looking at works that reflect on ourselves and bodies is topical. Looking at his other works, the image of the self in a digital physical world is quite interesting.

Wang: Is this a single channel video installation? I like this work very much also, it expresses the relationship between body and space in a fun way, against the exploration of self identity. It's a very interesting work.

Young: I like this work, I think it is visually, sonically compelling and engaging. I can imagine the scale of the projection in relationship to the body, that's makes it very effective. It's one of the more interesting works for me.

Fan: The next one is *Spectrum*.

Chung: It's quite difficult because there's not enough information to comment. Based on the first one I have some expectation about the type of material and how it only uses physical materials and objects to visualize the sound that is not audible to human beings as some kind of colors. I have some expectations to this approach, but unfortunately there is no other supporting materials for me to engage. I searched on the internet for the artist and found some of her previous works are also professional, so I have some expectations that there will be more that I can explore, but there is nothing in this submission.

Tamas: I also found it's a pity that we don't have more material, there is just one image and a short description. I found the whole idea very interesting, but based on the material, I don't understand and I am not sure if this works moves or changes based on some kind of input sound and reacts to the input, or it's just a frozen sculpture? How the artist would like to exhibit this work, on a pedestal or in a room? All these things are unclear and it's very difficult to judge this work with such a minimum amount of information.

Lee: It's a very difficult work to appreciate. The entry could benefit with a video of the artist's intent, whether it's a video or audio file. It's hard to make a commentary on that.

Wang: It's a sound installation, but it's unclear to understand the actual form or effect of the work.

Young: I agree. There is some expectation, but the lack of materials makes it difficult.

Fan: The next work is *Spirotrope*.

Chung: From the submission of the additional material and the original work, I found it is a very well-crafted piece of work, something like a kinetic sculpture. The connection with those drawings, and I don't get how that motor or that rotating machine works together. I understand this spirograph or harmonograph, some parts of the machine are built to draw those kinds of patterns. He probably makes use of the pre-drawn pattern that the audience needs to prepare by themselves and mount it on his machine to create some form of illusion by using the strobe light. It combines the idea of early cinema and kinetic sculpture. I'm not sure what is the motivation of combining them, or whether it works very well by combining these two things into one piece of video artwork. The installation is very well crafted.

Tamas: I also like this work, it was well-designed. I like this kind of combination of old and new technology. This work is the opposite of the previous one, you get every detail. You get beautiful videos of how this or that part works, how you have to turn on the light, etc. It's very beautiful and nice. My only concern with the work is if you want the public to interact with this work, maybe it can be quite complicated because the audience has to sit down and draw. I'm sure they need some kind of help or control, you have to give them pens or pencils and show how to put the drawing into the equipment. It seems to me this way of interaction is a little complicated, but I guess based on the video that this type of machinery is a beauty and works very nicely.

Lee: I do appreciate the craftsmanship that he's put into it and the rigor and the making, the process, documentation. He's very careful. I can recognize the efforts in detailing the technical aspects of the work and try to engage with the audience somehow through drawing is quite nice, but the practical issue of doing that in a space is another issue. It's a nicely crafted work, but if we're considering a wider context of our contemporary world and various complexities, I think the idea could go a lot further.

Wang: For the first image, it's a very interesting idea for me, but the installation form is similar to a scientific experiment, so for me, the concept is not so clear. The way of interacting with the audience is not clear enough. There may be safety concerns in the exhibition space.

Young: This is a well-made work, there's a good level of professionalism and craftsmanship. It works as an experiment as the documentation clearly shows. But I find it less interesting because I want the artist to go beyond the scientific experiment that shows the machine works. I felt the work could go further.

Fan: The next work is *The Puzzle I*.

Chung: I enjoy the idea of going back to the 1960s and 1970s in Hong Kong, there were a lot

of plastic factories, and nowadays they have gone to China or somewhere else. Those toys and tools in our childhood that we played or made use of everyday. She has constructed a magic lantern in the opposite direction in which we look at the centre and the light projects outwards, like shadow theatre, in a sense. Because of the simplicity of the machine, the structure of the narrative, the stories she can tell is a little bit limited. We see very nice images that makes use of those objects, and it's something like an amusement park experience, and it's very enjoyable as well. It's also tied to the context of decades ago in Hong Kong, in the pre-information age, the cottage factories that we had this kind of production. It's a bit nostalgic. I'm not sure if we can expand the narrative beyond those rotating mechanism, into a more complex way to lay out the narrative in another form.

Tamas: It's a nice work, playful and colorful. I can imagine it has a strong effect in an exhibition. But I have two problems with this work. One is that, as we all know, there are several works from famous artists based on shadows, like those of Christian Boltanski and others. At ifva we have also had another piece that plays with colorful shadows. The other problem is that the work, technically speaking, is very simple. No interaction, no higher level technology. It's really nice and impressive but for me, it's a little bit too easy and simple.

Lee: I agree, it's visually interesting and has a nice shadow play based on Hong Kong icons, but you want to read into the work a bit more, perhaps the stories behind some of these objects. Beyond a playful composition of light, shadows and scale, what else can be added to the work to give it a deeper exploration? I think it could go a lot further.

Wang: I agree with the comments from Tamas and Sarah. In this work, media and history are combined into cultural memories, but the form is too simple and easy. It seems to only present visual interest of the environment. It's colorful, but maybe too simple.

Young: The work is pretty and nicely made, if there's a layer of interaction that is beyond just the form, if there's a layer of meaning about narrative and memory, that layer is not immediately obvious.

Fan: The next work is *Unerasable Characters II*.

Chung: For this work, it'd be much better for me to go to the Arts Centre to have a look in terms of the scale. In the original proposal, there is a huge projection of disappearing Chinese characters due to censorship in Chinese social media and news channels. I like this piece of work, the only thing I'm a little bit concerned is the use of tools in the Weiboscope, in this case, probably if she may have her own interpretation or version of censorship in the Chinese social media, it'd be better or more coherent, rather than using ready-made tools. In terms of the presentation, it's also a bit site-specific because of the large-scale projection. From the documentation, it reminds me of the beginning of the movie *The Matrix* with the flashing and changing characters. Whether

it can tie to the idea or seriousness of the censorship cases in China, I'm not sure yet. I appreciate her approach with a little bit more silence as a way to deal with the heavy issue of censorship in a poetic way of projection.

Tamas: I like this work, although I have to admit I don't understand the characters at all. Based on the description, it's a very strong work. I can imagine if it is a large projection, it can have a strong and deep effect. This work is very minimalistic but clear, it's very well-designed. It's one of the works that I like the best.

Lee: For me, this work has a visual clarity, and like *Living to Die*, it's about the visualization of data from the Web, and it's becoming a strong part of our lives. To see this work on a large scale would be interesting. For me it's a clear piece of work.

Wang: I think the artist wants to discuss the speed of information explosion in the digital age. However, the textual information and the performance of the single channel recording doesn't seem to be able to fully present the active meaning. How to use the text in the media is a problem for me.

Young: I like the fact that every aspect of this work is straight forward, and it's easy to imagine at that scale, how it's going to work. The scale, combined with the simplicity of the visual aesthetic, befits the content of the work. We can think of it as minimalist and simplistic, if you think of it as clinical precision, then it fits the content. I like this work.

Fan: The last work is *What Are You Watching*.

Chung: This one is also a bit difficult based on the documentation. I anticipate it's some kind of live performance by the artist somewhere in the venue, and at the same time she is inviting the audience to peek into her performance, then she uses surveillance camera to reveal the position of the audience. The idea is not very innovative, it had happened in the 1970s or 1980s with conceptual art. The only thing I like about the work is it's about this phenomenon in Mainland China, the livestream culture. Everything they can think of can be livestreamed, including shopping or eating or whatever kind of conceptual activities, they convert this type of livestream consumption into some sort of business opportunity as well. In the venue, that can be quite entertaining, but the idea is not very sophisticated.

Tamas: It's a nice work, it well-designed, it's a performance and installation together. My only problem with this work was that based on the video, the installation is not very professionally made. There are these texts on the wall, it seems quite homemade and not a professional or well-designed environment. It's interesting and playful, I can imagine such a work being popular. I can understand why she wants to speak about this everyday problem. It's a quite complex construction, with the surveillance cameras, performance and monitors, and how she lets the audience peek into their reality and compare it with the video streaming. It's quite nice, I hope the ifva

exhibition will install it in a more professional way.

Fan: We did, I hope you can see it.

Lee: I find the work has a lot of energy and is quite interesting. It's a reaction to contemporary society but also a reflection of the self. It plays on our voyeuristic traits and the idea of peeping into a person's face is powerful yet disturbing. I quite like this work.

Wang: I agree with comments from Tamas. This work discusses the relationship between self media and the masses in the internet age. The video production and the installation form are too simple. It could be better.

Young: I like this work, I think conceptually and the performance aspect of it ties in very well to the idea of the work. I think this will probably be a mess in the actual exhibition, and I wonder how much of that mess is intended. How is the experience with the curatorial team with this work on site?

Fan: We did some adjustments for the exhibition because this year, the judging is based on the documentation. I can share more about the exhibition, but let's stick to the documentation for the judging. We have already gone through the 10 finalist works. Next, we have to decide on the awards. We have three awards, the Gold Award, with HK\$50,000 cash prize, a Silver Award, with HK\$30,000 cash prize, and also a Special Mention with just a certificate. The top winner of the Hong Kong division will also be entitled to a festival visit which is sponsored by Goethe Institut. In case we don't have any winners from the Hong Kong division, then we have to pick one to get this award. Let's see if you have any nominations for the Gold Award?

Lee: Can we start with shortlisting which are your top 3 or 4 perhaps?

Tamas: Perhaps everyone can say their top 3 works. My three favorites are *Unerasable Characters II*, *Modern Body* and *Give No Words but Mum*.

Young: My top three are *Give No Words but Mum*, *Modern Body* and *Unerasable Characters II*.

Chung: I have *Give No Words but Mum*, *Modern Body* and *Living to Die*. I make comparison between the two of them.

Lee: *Give No Words but Mum*, *Modern Body* and I am torn between *Living to Die* and *Unerasable Characters II*.

Wang: For me, the top three are *Give No Words but Mum*, *Living to Die* and *Modern Body*.

Fan: Five of you have chosen *Give No Words but Mum* and *Modern Body*. Shall we begin by discussing these two works?

Tamas: I like *Modern Body* very much, but it seems to me *Give No Words but Mum* is a bit more complex because it has a kind of interaction and video screening, and also uses the space in a more complex way. It has interaction, space design, video streaming. It seems to be more complex than *Modern Body*, which is only a one channel screening.

Lee: I think the complexity of *Give No Words but Mum* is higher than *Modern Body*. However, *Modern Body* is very well filmed, and there's a technical aspect to that. With *Give No Words but Mum*, I was wondering about the film content, and whether there is an issue with the work in terms of copyright.

Tamas: I was also thinking about that, but I think she's using very short sequences, so I hope that's alright from the point of view of copyright.

Fan: So, Tamas and Sarah nominate *Give No Words but Mum* for the Gold Award? Any other nominations?

Chung: For me, it's the same, because of the complexity of the work and the contextual reference to Hong Kong and the current situation, so I also support *Give No Words but Mum*.

Young: I like *Modern Body* more, it's more mature.

Wang: It's quite difficult to decide. For me *Give No Words but Mum* is an exploration of multiple things, power, politics, etc. *Modern Body* is more natural. I will give my vote to *Give No Words but Mum*.

Fan: *Give No Words but Mum* has 4 votes. Samson, are you okay with that? So, the Gold Award goes to *Give No Words but Mum*. Since this is also a Hong Kong work, the artist will also get the festival visit prize. Then we will talk about the Silver.

Tamas: It should go to *Modern Body*, it has got 5 nominations.

Fan: Is that okay with everyone? Sometimes votes do not equal preference. Or do you have other works you would like to nominate?

Lee: Yes to *Modern Body*.

(The other jurors agree.)

Fan: How about Special Mention? Two works that have received two votes are *Living to*

Die and Unerasable Characters II.

- Chung: Can we have two Special Mentions? The votes are evenly distributed.
- Fan: Yes, we could, but if you can still weigh the two of them, then it's better to give out one award. If you think they are equal in terms of quality and you want to give awards to both, we can also arrange.
- Tamas: I like both works. *Unerasable Characters II* is a bit better, but *Living to Die* comes from Macau, and it'd be nice to have one prize from Hong Kong, one from Japan and one from Macau. It'd be nice to share
- Wang: I like *Living to Die* more.
- Lee: I also like *Living to Die* more. It has potential.
- Fan: How about Samson? You didn't choose *Living to Die*.
- Young: I chose two other works after the top three, and *Living to Die* is one of those two. I do like it, but personally I like *Unerasable Characters II* better. I can very much picture how that is going to work in the space. But given the situation, it is good to give *Living to Die* the benefit of doubt that it will work in the space as well. So, if it tilts one way, I'm willing to accept that.
- Chung: I like *Living to Die* more in comparison to *Unerasable Characters II*. The latter is more crystalized and pure in a sense, but *Living to Die* has some edgy thing, it's not a totally fixed form. The other thing that is not related to the work is that Winnie may have got some prize in the past, and Calvin may be the up-and-coming artist.
- Fan: You should judge based on the quality of the artwork.
- Chung: For me, I vote for *Living to Die*, it has a bit of uncertainty.
- Fan: That means the Special Mention goes to *Living to Die*.
- Chung: Or we can have two, since it doesn't involve money.
- Tamas: It's okay for me.
- Lee: I am inclined to both as well.
- Young: Yes.
- Fan: You want to give out two prizes, or just one prize to *Living to Die*?

Tamas: Both decisions could work for me.

Young: I'd like to see both works get awarded.

Fan: Is it okay for you, Mr. Wang, since you didn't choose *Unerasable Characters II*?

Wang: Is it unusual to give two Special Mention?

Fan: It is possible, but as I mentioned, it would be good if you can weigh the two works and award the better one. We don't want to give out a lot of awards just because they don't involve money, because it is both a recognition and an acknowledgement to the artist and the artwork. If you can choose between the two, then I would suggest giving out one. But if you like both and think they are equally good in quality and deserve awards, then we have the flexibility to do that.

Wang: Shall we take a vote?

Fan: We have to choose between giving out one award to *Living to Die* and giving out two awards to both. What do you think?

Wang: I like *Living to Die* more than *Unerasable Characters II*, but if the other jurors think they want to give awards to both, that's okay.

Fan: I am aware that you gave a low rank to this artwork.

Wang: I can agree to both works getting awards.

Fan: Do other jurors agree to give out two Special Mentions?

(The jurors nod in agreement.)

Fan: Alright, two Special Mentions to *Living to Die* and *Unerasable Characters II*.

26th Media Arts Category Award Winners

Gold Award

Give No Words but Mum

Lo Lai-lai Natalie

(Hong Kong)

Silver Award

Modern Body

Katsuki Nogami

(Japan)

Special Mention

Living to Die

Hoi In-wai Kelvin

(Macau)

Unerasable Characters II

Winnie Soon

Hong Kong