

This interview with Paul O'Neill was conducted by  
The Floorplan and Eunju Lee from *JoongAng Daily* via  
Skype and emails in March 2020.

The Floorplan: First of all, I thank you for taking your time for this interview. It's an honor to have an opportunity to talk with the author of *The Culture of Curating and the Curating of Culture(s)*, and to introduce your curatorial practice.

In recent decades, it seems there are many books written by curators on curating and the practice of other curators, including curators' autobiographical and personal essays. In addition to those books, the term "curating" is often used in the different context from contemporary art. Reflecting on this decades-long tendency, I'd like to start this interview with the same questions that Annie Fletcher has raised in your book *Curating Subjects* that was published in 2007. After a decade, do we really need another book about curating? Or, by now, do you think we have enough vocabularies to represent the changes that have occurred in the last few decades? What do you think about this trend inherent to our profession?

Paul O'Neill: It's a very good beginning to a conversation to go backwards, and experience a kind of *déjà vu* in relation to the time, 14 years ago from now, when that book was completed. If I remember correctly, when we, myself and Annie Fletcher, did that interview together, it was at a time when there really weren't many different materials available to represent the individual curatorial position. And also in terms of curatorial discourse, the field was primarily focused around a few individuals including Hans Ulrich Obrist, Ute Meta Bauer, Hou Hanru, Catherine David, Okwui Enwezor, Carlos Basualdo, Maria Lind, and others mostly connected to Biennial curating, primarily coming out of the 1990s generation, who has done innovative projects and has participated significantly within the emergence of newer biennales. And what was necessarily within *Curating Subjects* was to create an opportune material that was not yet there. So producing material was to recognize subjective position in terms of curating, but also to acknowledge in contemporary art about what is going to shift, what is going to accelerate globalization, and what is going to make the convergence of artistic and curatorial practices.

In response to that question if we need another book about curating, I'd probably respond similarly to the response with Annie in 2007. We always need more books about cultural production. We also need different books that are trying to engage with curating in different or critical ways. Certainly the questions about Westernizing curatorial practice, decentering curatorial history, or reorientation of curatorial functions beyond Western center or epicenters of cultural production still need to be addressed.

Since 2007, there definitely have been quite a lot of publications around curatorial practices. I feel that many of them have followed the particular format, that is an individual curator being central to publication, whether it be historicization of pioneer curator like Harald Szeemann, or proliferation of books by curators which put their own narrative in the a more global context. My position in relation to Hans Ulrich Obrist's interviews project is supportive. It's a by-product of this shift from practice to discourse, of discursive turns we have experienced in the 2000s, which is to use language, when speaking takes its form in artistic practice, curatorial positioning, or practising itself—writing, speaking, and producing discourses around art as a form of cultural practice. I think that what Obrist's interviews project is doing is to continue excavating histories that were not given. That is necessary. But I think we need to be more critical of shorthand curatorial publications that are very anecdotal. This is not just Obrist. There has been a tendency to produce publications, which are as forms of

glorifying bibliographies. This is less interesting to the field.

Also I think there is inherent contradiction in the field that we have an increasing number of curators whereas we have decreased opportunities for critical curators and curators who are looking at contemporary art in a critical way, so this is the issue which needs to be addressed on critical debates around curating and education about curating.

How is the book *The Culture of Curating and the Curating of Culture(s)* different from other books such as anthologies and curators' autobiographical essays?

It's different in that it's the first authored book about artist-curating. It also goes beyond the descriptive rhetoric of a curator's self-positioning. And it's the first book-length analysis of the culture of curating and globalization by a single author. In the same year of 2012, Terry Smith's *Thinking Contemporary Curating* was published slightly after. It's different in its form that it's written from a singular perspective. I hope it's written from an analytical perspective. I tried to analyze the emergence of vocabularies around curatorial practice from the late 1960s onwards, such as curator, curating, curatorship, and exhibition making, and to articulate the shift from contemporary art discourses towards curatorial discourse in the 2000s, with paralleled evolution of global art market and biennales.

Also it's different in that the basis of the book is a lot of primary materials, which are interviews with artists from Brian O'Doherty to Liam Gillick and Andrea Fraser and curators including Catherine David, Seth Siegelaub, Maria Lind, Okui Enwezor, Ute Meta Bauer amongst many others, who were being active during the period but have not been interviewed often in the 2000s. The interviews with over 100 curators and artists are the beginning of this book that enable it to go deep into multiple narratives around curating and the emergence of curating.

I'm a curator and writer, but primarily I see myself as an educator. So I tried the book to be more accessible in a way when I was editing it, and really tried as much as possible to have the history of curating clearly understandable, so it could be a starting point for those who want to go deeply into analyzing curating. And I tried to write a book that'd have educational value within and outside of the academy that could be used as a teaching tool for the analysis of contemporary art and curatorial practice since the 1960s.

*The Culture of Curating and the Curating of Culture(s)* considers the curatorial as a space of thinking that doesn't necessitate an exhibition as only private form. One can think curatorially, act curatorially, and can be thinking of curatorial practice as a process of engagement, becomingness, and emergence. It's a different way of thinking because it sees the space of curatorial is not object-oriented production. It also tries to analyze amnesia around history of exhibitions, that examines those exhibitions are necessarily understood as collaboration, participation, and cooperation. Cultural production needs to be perceived as a constellation of activities by artists, critics, curators, collectors, and the field itself. Furthermore, it addresses that it's in need of institutional critique. Art itself is institution and it needs critique, so we need to think how we can be critical towards institutional frame.

You've mentioned you see yourself primarily as an educator. For the last decades, you've researched curating as a discipline and contributed to developing and expanding discourses around curating, and worked as a director of The Graduate Program at the Center for Curatorial Studies at Bard College in the US. However you moved to Helsinki a few years ago, and now you are working as an artistic director of PUBLICS. This move is related to your ongoing interest in how we can be critical to institutional frame?

I think my move to Helsinki from the CCS Bard College is partially personal, wanting to return to Europe after more than 4 years away, but also I'm very invested in the possibility of setting up a small-scale public art institution that could work in a cooperative and collaborative way. As an artistic director of PUBLICS, a small-scaled institution in the city, we are committed to decentering the authorial position within the institution, so we explore a "work together" institutional model with multiple overlapping objectives, thematic strands, and collaborations through many art events, classes, seminars, and talks and so forth. Also after 4 years of working within a very committed but stressful private educational context, I thought I wanted to spend a bit of time outside of formal educational structures.

Eunju Lee: As one of the reasons you moved to Helsinki, you mentioned you want to work outside of formal educational structure. Can you explain further what made you think that?

After working mostly within third level education for the last 30 years, as a curatorial practitioner I wanted to go back to focus on working with art, artists, and other culture workers in a more public way—making things and ideas more public as part of the curatorial and institutional process. About 2 years ago, I was appointed as Artistic Director of Checkpoint Helsinki, an initiative established in 2013. The invitation allowed me to reimagine how Checkpoint Helsinki could evolve and develop in the future. Checkpoint Helsinki was established as an association by a group of artists and activists to resist the Guggenheim coming to Helsinki. They developed public art projects, conferences, and publications and brought international curators and practitioners to engage with Finnish art and to show alongside local artists. As an activist organization, another priority was to monitor how decisions are made in the city, in terms of the distribution of funds towards culture and the arts. Some of these elements and commitments—like critical and social thinking, working together, and being engaged in emerging debates—are still very important to PUBLICS. I proposed to the board that we could change the name to something more proactive and positive.

The term 'publics' suggests a constellation of different practices, projects, and productions. There are many diverse groups of people that constitute the public, whether imagined or abstract, real or actualised. The public means different things in different parts of the world and has diverging implications for various disciplines, from sociology and anthropology, to contemporary art and philosophy. The term 'publics' is also maybe moving away from this binary of private and public, suggesting that all spaces are public in some way. We now have a physical space and it's the primary site for the PUBLICS Library (designed by Julia studio who also designed PUBLICS' identity)—which currently has about 6,000 publications. This is unique within the city and possibly Europe, with such a specific focus on the curatorial, publicness, activism, and the spaces where philosophy and political-thinking intersect with contemporary art. Talks, events, and performances happen regularly at PUBLICS, often in collaboration with other organizations in the city, regionally and internationally. The backbone of our programme is the commissioning and co-production of public artworks outside the normative spaces of galleries and museums. Sometimes PUBLICS is an exhibition space, a cinema, a school, sometimes we remain a library or a gathering space. We have previously exhibited work and exhibited with many artists—however, PUBLICS is not primarily a gallery.

figure of curator in contemporary art, biennale culture, and the convergence of art and curatorial practice. Considering the fact that the book was originally published in 2012, do you have other moments or turns you would like to add to the book?

If I want to write the 4<sup>th</sup> chapter, it would probably be the acknowledgement of the contradiction between the expansion of education for curators and shrinking of opportunities, which is the gap between expectation and the reality. I think what was perceived as an opening out of contemporary art through curating is now shrinking of criticality. However many graduates from curatorial education programs are not always interested in working within larger institutions, from my experience coming from the CCS Bard. They are often interested in working within small and medium-scale institutions. They're interested in critical writing, artistic practices which may expand beyond the museum or gallery context, such as performance, long durational processes, working with more social and participatory practices, or standing from diverse feminist, queer, trans, anti-racist, intersectional perspectives.

I'd also like to look at the questions of privilege, accessibility, class, and cultural belongings. I would probably want to engage more directly with de-Westernizing, decolonizing, and de-centralizing from the class perspective. I think when reading *The Culture of Curating* now there's nothing in the book that contradicts the present moment, so it still reads true. But I'd like to look at this post-global condition, re-emergence of ethno-fascism, the protectionist national state, and hardening of the borders, and to question what it means to be a curator after the globalization, the end of Eurocentric Western globalization, and the moment when a great level of accessibility has opened up to the non-Western and the rest of the world. It's still not yet completely clear as to what post-global condition is bringing, but what I can see is that there's parallel emergence of acceleration of neoliberalism and privatization of individuals and their lives, alongside the rise of neo-fascism, populism, open racism, and cultural protectionism, that are resistance towards anything from outside. These two are happening in parallel. They are different from one another, but not exclusive to one another. They mainly influence contemporary art and cultural production.

Another issue I will probably engage with is the cause and effect of globalization of contemporary art on climate crisis and environmental changes. In last years, I'd say about 5 years, what we are seeing is the acknowledgement of how Western globalization has contributed to climate changes and crisis. We are seeing critics being nomadic, cheap cultural tourism, and people traveling here and there to biennales and art fairs. I don't see global curating as problematic. But this rise of, what I'd call eco-fascism, needs to take account further concerns and issues. We have to be careful about looking at this correlation between climate changes and expanding global curatorial market because not everybody is beneficent from this period of globalization. If the automatic response is to close down the borders, to harden the nation states, and to resist transculturalism that has been, at least, one of the productive aspects of globalism and Westernizing contemporary art, then it'd be counterproductive more widely. The separation of political ideology, and focusing on a certain agenda at the expense of other agenda is unproductive.

In terms of the historical context of curating you've analyzed, what does the present mean for curators? What issues do the curators of today face?

At a time when we are experiencing a continued consolidation of the discursive field around curating, as many protagonists are attempting to define, through limitation,

what curating should be, or should seek to be, and to determine which bodies of knowledge shall have enduring consequence for the practice of curating, and for its associated discourses and histories. Within this context, I would not want to limit what is possible today for curatorial practice nor to place limitation upon its futures. Today, we need to find ways to work together more effectively, more ethically, more socially, environmentally and ethically aware, and in a more culturally inclusive manner during a time of global crisis, such as the issue of human rights and rise of ethno-fascism. Also we need to find new ways of cooperating in the face of severe opposition to any productive change and for equalities and rights for the less privileged.

I am responding here at a moment when the world is going into lockdown because of the COVID-19 that it is urgent we use this moment to look again at how we are doing, what we are doing in our world, and if we have impact on others, and to consider how curators and contemporary artists as citizens can find ways of making our work more urgent, effective, socially inclusive, and transformative within such immediately critical contexts.

How do curatorial discourses influence making an exhibition and art? What does the audience need to note about curating when experiencing an exhibition?

I think it is somehow represented within an exhibition that many participate in production coming together for an exhibition. But their individual roles and participation within construction and production of exhibition seem often deleted and erased or less evident. I think it's important to acknowledge when looking at an exhibition that there are many people and different voices involved in it coming together. It's not just a work of an artist, nor as a work of a curator, but a work of many curators, installers, facilitators, mediators, and agents of production and co-production.

I think an exhibition is, as I've mentioned in the chapter 3 of *The Culture of Curating*, a form by a number of groundings, which are the background, the middle ground, and the foreground. I use a metaphor for the exhibition as 'landscape', which functions as a structuring device for the three different groundings: the background, which surrounds the viewer who moves through it; the middleground as the place where the viewer can partially interact with it (thinking about lighting, exhibition furniture, wall labels, seating, display cabinets, and so forth); and the foreground, being that which contains the viewer in the space of display. I still think all exhibitions primarily function in that way; they are environments; they are spatial contexts which surround you; they have spatiality which surrounds the viewer, so one experiences the exhibition by moving through it. It's something that can be experienced by all different senses. All these spatial aspects are evident within all exhibitions. These are spatial elements in every exhibition even before anything is exhibited in the museum context. In the middleground, being that which you can interact with partially, is a kind of mechanic nature of exhibition where the viewer is asked to sit in a certain way, to look in a certain way, or to read the wall text in a certain way... I think all these design elements or middlegroundings—such as lighting, sitting, labels, colour of walls, how much natural light there is, and what kind of models are being used, whether it be thematic exhibition, monographic exhibition, or group exhibition—and the ways in which an artist uses them enable a lot of voices to coexist and change within the production of everything in an exhibition. The foreground is an artwork itself. It devises in a gallery, and it leads the gallery into the physical and metaphysical state. I think even in the foreground there are many agents and actors in production of work, that we call art. It's a very complicated form or medium. So if one would like to analyze the medium of exhibition, it's necessary to acknowledge that it's a constitution of forms of the three

different groundings: the background, the middleground, and the foreground.

Also it needs to acknowledge that there is an additional grounding, which is the viewer, the spectators themselves. The viewer completes the exhibition. It's an early modernist idea, but it still stands today. Exhibition is an exhibition when it is made public. It has to be experienced by others. Exhibition creates the context, which asks the viewer to navigate in a particular way, read in a particular way either spatially, perceptually, linguistically, visually, and so forth. Curating contributes towards how we perceive art and I think it's always necessary. I'd say yes or no if I'm asked whether it's important to read critical and curatorial discourse in advance to experience an exhibition. It's important to acknowledge and understand that art is constructed from nowhere, but it comes from the circle. As an educator, I think curatorially, and curatorial thinking helps as a way of reading the world. In a sense, it might be different from seeing the world as a series of subjective productions and subjective positions. I rather see the world from multiple perspectives. For all exhibitions are collaborative even though they may never announce the nature of collaboration, we need to acknowledge that they're a part of a larger system and cultural value production.

Do you expect the reaction of the viewer in advance when you're curating? How much importance do you place on the audience?

There is no exhibition, in whatever form it takes, without public participation. When we set up PUBLICS here in Helsinki, we did a lot of public talks and events, and we were always packed out. We want to bridge certain discussions that are happening in the city already with the conversations we want to have around inequality in the arts and with discrimination in all forms. Our focus is to try to diversify audiences for the arts, so that means taking on issues relating to gender politics, queer politics, and so forth. Our 'Parahosting' events have been one way to highlight issues that weren't so well represented before PUBLICS. 'Parahosting' can be everything from a book launch, to a residency, to a durational performance, to a reading group, to week-long conference or pop-up installation. PUBLICS becomes the host to other people, other bodies and their ideas; it is taken over and on many levels, it is preoccupied by them.

However, our current focus is financial sustainability and bridging the gap between small-scale organizations and the larger institutions, such as museums, across the city. We are trying to grow our organization into a medium-scale organization, as a way of supporting the ongoing, sustainable, and long-term economic system of support for culture and contemporary art in the city and region. We are trying to be useful and supportive towards a wide range of audiences and participants in art and to make a difference during globally difficult times.

Speaking of experiencing spatiality when seeing an exhibition, in recent years, there seems many online museums are emerging in the art world. What do you think about experiencing art or exhibition in these online museums?

I think I wouldn't ever limit what art could be, or what an exhibition could be, so I think even online space, digital environment, or virtual environment can be productive space for exhibition. But I also think it often limits experience navigating around, and online museum or online experience of art can be reductive, anti-social, apolitical, and can accelerate the privatization of politics. For example, those image-based platforms like Instagram, these are not spaces of the curatorial. These are spaces of editing, self-representation, pseudo-public spaces, and they are much more about visual representation, juxtaposition, much more about narrowing of what public citizenship

and public perception can be because it's shorthand, immediate, and fleeting.

I am rather conservative as I started to experience a work before the Internet or digitalization of everything. Maybe it's harder for me than the generation who's brought up with smartphone and email accounts. I think online spaces are spaces of class division, economic division, and cultural division. Although they have global reach, they are not universally accessible. Many people in the world do not have access to these platforms. Perhaps my media response is resistant. Sometimes it's said to open up new possibilities, for example to say anything can be curating or anything can be exhibition, but it can also result in a kind of anti-democratic gestures, series of gestures. It's not a democratization of power. It's actually quite the opposite. Having an Instagram account is not to be more democratic; having so many followers doesn't make it critically relevant. This is the falsity and scariness of social media for me.

I believe curator needs to be committed to acknowledging that art can do something good, art can make things differently, and art is something vital for contemporary existence, and to work with art and artist is important so as to make an idea public in exhibition and imagine how the world could be. I think curator should have a relationship with art, with artists and other collaborators, and not only your screen, not your Instagram account.

What do you think about the effects of Instagram? Don't you think "the time of Instagram" has changed the way of seeing for the viewer?

Instagram has not replaced museums or exhibitions as social and temporal spaces for art's experience, but it has created another way for us to look at images, on our own, juxtaposed with other images—serially, flattened, in multiples, and mostly without much contextual information. It has added to an already image-saturated culture, and it has created a different kind of socializing through image distribution within a globally networked society. It could also be anti-social in the traditional sense and can feed upon the racialized social distancing rhetoric of our time. It is worth saying that having a busy Instagram account does not make for good curating.

Do you think the way of seeing an artwork in the museum context could be maintained? What kind of changes do you expect in the future?

I think we need a diversity of museums to show different approaches and engagements with art, politics, and exhibits. We need more discursive and research-oriented museums as well as exhibitionary museums that explore new ways of reimagining the white cube and its associative hegemonic power/authorship, its Western modernist histories, and its many critiques of extant mechanisms and more stable display structures.

One contested way this has been happening is circulating around and in relation to 'the curatorial' in discussions since the mid-2000s: Irit Rogoff talked about the curatorial as a 'critical thought' that does not rush to embody itself, rather it unravels over time; Maria Lind discussed the curatorial as going beyond that which is already known; Beatrice Von Bismarck framed the curatorial as continuous spaces of negotiation; while Emily Pethick described the curatorial as allowing for things to merge in the process of being realised. I found these four propositions important, in asserting the exhibition as a collaborative research action. I think that the curatorial exists in all aspects of my work as a teacher, writer, researcher, exhibition-maker, event organiser, organization director, and so forth. But I am also using the curatorial as a kind of contested term—not yet fully disclosed or constructed—which captures forms

of curatorial practice that don't necessarily result in exhibitions, objects, or material forms. Exhibitions can be really productive outcomes even within white cubes, but I think that exhibition-making is only one part of the curatorial constellation.

There are many students who dream of becoming curators. It may be because they don't fully understand the role of a curator or see only the glamorous image that the figure of curator has. What is required to be a curator? What kinds of knowledge and qualifications are needed? As an educator, what do you try to teach to your students? What are the important points that you stress to them?

I believe in student-centered teaching so education needs to be flexible and dialogical. I don't think it is possible to teach curating, but it is something that can be learnt—it is possible to show examples or to point in certain directions, whether that is towards certain artists that might be dealing with certain issues and concerns that students might be clashed with. It is possible to direct towards previous examples of curatorial practices and exhibitions that may or may not be canonical. But also to account for an understanding of publicness, and how exhibitions, in whatever forms they take, constitute the temporary audience around the project and the projects themselves. There are many examples, disciplines, and discussions that we can draw upon. There are many skills, knowledge, networks, understanding of research, and the level of the depth of research that validate a curator to put on a good show, to evolve an interesting curatorial practice, and to support how to look at something in a way that may be unexpected and also not prescribed. It is important to work ethically and to think about methodologies and how we work with each other, without seeing theory or an understanding of theory as something that is separate from practice but something that is integral to it.

Students themselves learn from each other as much as they learn from a teacher, or a professor, or a director, so I believe in co-teaching and learning with students—learning through doing, writing as a form of doing, as a form of speculation, and as a form of self-articulation, producing something as an individual or as a group whether that be an exhibition or a publication, or it be organizing together. When students come through the door, they are already curators with their individual concerns and interests. I try to develop how they might evolve towards a clearer sense of a future practice, and research interests for the future, and to help to begin projects by connecting with one another, which is really important. What defines curatorial practice is not what you situate in a single exhibition, but what is situated in a series of projects that evolve in a clear trajectory.

I think the starting point of all the curatorial projects, even if they only exist at the level of the discursive and non-object based, is action moments, which involve other people. It is a socialized practice that involves arts and some capacity. To widen knowledge through decentering, decolonizing, de-Westernizing education, and widening access to art, artists, and practices from multiple perspectives and cultural contexts is a very important part of the curatorial education.

I'd also like to ask some questions about your personal aspects. Why did you become a curator, instead of an artist? What is the most memorable exhibition in your life so far?

I made many exhibitions as an artist but was less interested in making art than working with art and artists. I wanted to work with others, to find ways of collaborating in more cooperative and co-productive structures, and to consider curating as a form of being



with the world and its material practices. In terms of my experiences, many exhibition by a wide range of curators have been unforgettable for me, such as those early group shows of Hans Ulrich Obrist, and any exhibition I have seen curated by Maria Lind, Okwui Enwezor, Annie Fletcher, Anselm Franke, Lia Gangitano, Helen Molesworth, Gabi Ngcobo, What, How & for Whom, Ute Meta Bauer, Binna Choi, General Idea, Renee Green, Julie Ault, and many others and of course those by artists who already curate within their own practice.

But to follow up on your question, I was thinking of the first phase of *We are the CCS at Bard College* which I co-curated in 2017. Each of the invited artists (30 at that stage) were invited to exhibit, research, and teach. Primarily, they exhibited work, which could be defined as curatorial, bringing together a constellation of differences; they gave lectures, workshops, or seminars with the students. We explored ways for the final exhibition form to emerge over a long period of time, with artists visiting at different stages. The exhibition was a way of looking at different methods in which the curatorial could manifest itself as part of an educational process of collaboration. The exhibition itself became a teaching and learning environment for the students; every phase provided opportunities to learn about constructing an exhibition and about working with artists and each other. It argues for thinking of the 'curatorial' as an open concept and prioritizes the many ways and means of working with one another within a temporary space of cooperation that allows ideas to emerge in the process of doing, speaking, and being together.

Speaking of globalization, what was your impression about the art scene in Korea in this globalized art world?

I was there in a very specific context of the international symposium *What Do Museums Research* at the National Museum of Modern and Contemporary Art, Korea, organized by the team Research and Publication. It was impressive that the museum has not only curatorial team but also research and publication team, which is the curatorial team mainly working on education and research. And it keeps balance between curating as exhibition production and curating as research, publication, and conference. It shows a definite shift that museum should be more discursive and acknowledges the significance of research and publication besides exhibition. It was interesting time to be there and I met many curators who are doing interesting works. As for the symposium itself, it wasn't so easy to see how Korea is being positioned within the global context, but the MMCA was definitely arguing 'museum as research', not just an institution to produce an exhibition.

In terms of my impression of the art scene, I've talked with great publishers and designers, and visited great bookshops, discursive spaces including The Reference, The Book Society, and so on. I found it interesting that there is emergent interest in bookshops. Also I have an impression that there is a gap between big infrastructures, museums, and institutions and small and medium scale institutions. Those big institutions seem super professional and well installed in the level of large institution to the enormous city. And small and medium sized institutions are interesting especially those located in the sector where The Book Society is.

Do you have some words you would like to say to Korean art audience and readers?

I'd like to say it'd be a great honor if they read my books and support The Floorplan. I think what The Floorplan is doing is to increase awareness about discourses around contemporary art and curatorial practice. I think it's important to open up a room

for the interrelationship between local and international critical response to the book. I hope that we get to talk about contemporary curatorial practice and both global and local issues. Also I think it's important to support independent and small scale publishers and art practitioners working independently and alternatively because they are based upon any contemporary culture. The support of Korean art audiences and readers would enable a more long-term critical discussion on the issues the book has opened up.

In many ways, writing and publishing a book is the beginning of its life. It may take many years to research, write, and edit, but I strongly believe the primary aim is to take critical debates after they've been published. I hope we can have an opportunity to continue our dialogues, conversations, and debates about what my research has brought up.