

Museums in Progress:  
Public Interest,  
Private Resources?

CIMAM 2014 Annual  
Conference Proceedings

Mathaf: Arab Museum  
of Modern Art  
Doha 9 — 11 November 2014

## Sunday 9 November 2014 What Is Public Interest Today?

### *Welcoming Speeches:*

- Abdellah Karroum, Director, Mathaf: Arab Museum of Modern Art
- Her Excellency Sheikha Al Mayassa bint Hamad bin Khalifa Al-Thani, chairperson, Qatar Museums Board of Trustees
- Catherine Robert-Hauglustaine, General Director of ICOM
- Bartomeu Marí, President of CIMAM

*Perspective 1:* Graham W. J. Beal, Director, Detroit Institute of Arts, Detroit

*Perspective 2:* Maria Lind, curator and writer, Director of Tensta Konsthall, Stockholm

*Perspective 3:* Olav Velthuis, Associate Professor at the Department of Sociology and Anthropology, University of Amsterdam

*Perspective 4:* Rana Sadik, collector and Director of MinRASY Projects, Kuwait

*Q&A with perspective speakers*

---

## Monday 10 November 2014 Building Institutions in the African and the Middle East Contexts

### *Welcoming Remarks:*

- Gerd Nonneman, SFS Qatar (Georgetown University), School of Foreign Service in Qatar, Dean and Professor of International Politics and Gulf Studies
- Dr Abdulla Al-Thani, Managing Director and Member of the Board, Qatar Leadership Centre.
- Bartomeu Marí, President of CIMAM

### *Panel Discussion:*

- Ute Meta Bauer, Director of the Centre for Contemporary Art (CCA), Singapore. Moderator
- Salwa Mikdadi, Associate Professor of the Practice of Art History at the New York University Abu Dhabi

- Gabi Ngcobo, curator and member of faculty at The Wits School of Arts, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg
- Abdellah Karroum, Director, Mathaf: Arab Museum of Modern Art, Doha

*Perspective 1:* Gabi Ngcobo, curator and member of faculty at The Wits School of Arts, University of Witwatersrand, Johannesburg

*Perspective 2:* Suha Shoman, Artist, Founder and Chair of the Khalid Shoman Foundation and Darat al Funun, Amman

*Perspective 3:* Zeina Arida, Director, Sursock Museum, Beirut.

*Perspective 4:* Abdellah Karroum, Director, Mathaf: Arab Museum of Modern Art, Doha.

*Q&A with perspective speakers*

---

## Tuesday 11 November 2014 Private to Public, Public to Private: What Are the New Professional Practices?

*Keynote 1:* Luiz Augusto Teixeira de Freitas, Art collector and founding member of Teixeira de Freitas Rodrigues e Associados, Lisbon

*Perspective 1:* Kate Fowle, Chief Curator at Garage Museum of Contemporary Art, Moscow and Director-at-large at Independent Curators International (iCi), New York

*Perspective 2:* Bernard Blistène, Director, Musée national d'art moderne, Paris

*Q&A with perspective speakers*

*Panel Discussion:* Luiz Augusto Teixeira de Freitas, Art Collector and Founding Member of Teixeira de Freitas Rodrigues e Associados, Lisbon. Kate Fowle, Chief Curator at Garage Museum of Contemporary Art, Moscow. Bernard Blistène, Director, Musée National d'Art Moderne, Paris. Eugene Tan, Director, National Gallery Singapore. Fionn Meade, Curator, Walker Art Center, Minneapolis. Moderated by Mami Kataoka, Chief Curator, Mori Art Museum, Tokyo

Sunday  
9 November  
2014

# Welcoming speeches

Abdellah Karroum: Welcome to Doha, everyone. You've come from different continents and countries. I just wanted to say something about this space, the performance space at Mathaf, which we use for our performance programme and conferences. It's a popular building as well, which has been open now for four years with a great artistic programme. Before we officially start the CIMAM conference I am pleased to welcome Her Excellency Sheikha Al Mayassa bint Hamad bin Khalifa Al-Thani, Chairperson of the Board of Trustees of Qatar Museums, to speak to the CIMAM 2014 Annual Conference delegates. [Applause]

---

Her Excellency Sheikha Al Mayassa bint Hamad bin Khalifa Al-Thani: Good morning. Distinguished guests, colleagues, ladies and gentlemen. Welcome to Mathaf, the Arab Museum of Modern Art. I'm glad to see a diverse gathering of professionals representing cultural institutions from all around the world. In the coming days we will be listening to, and engaging with, different perspectives which will ultimately widen our horizons and thinking about contemporary art and what it represents. I welcome you to Doha and its really bad traffic — it's particularly bad today, so for those of you who are just getting in, we all understand the pain in getting into the museum.

Qatar Museum, like Qatar itself, is a young institution with great ambition. Culture and art support the realisation of our national vision. They nurture the transformation of a hydrocarbon nation to one based on diversity, by supporting and establishing creative networks. Culture connects people of all walks of life. It has no passport or religion, and it establishes a tolerant platform for dialogue. We are proud that as a relative youngster—Mathaf itself is only four years old—we are graduating into the company of museums and institutions in the global art world, from as far afield as Chicago, Tokyo, San Francisco and the Arab world. We welcome you all to Doha, alongside colleagues from the thriving arts and academic communities of Qatar itself.

In Qatar we believe in partnerships, and I'm sure that many new networks will be made in the coming days. Key to our vision for arts and creativity in Qatar is the need to balance progress with heritage. Earlier this year we hosted the 38th UNESCO World Heritage Conference with Qatar's first UNESCO World Heritage site named at the

ancient fort of Al Zubarah in the north of the country. We are also in the process of conserving and transforming our old fire station into an artists-in-residency centre. The building is well under way and will open its doors to artists in the next few weeks.

As active members both of ICOM and CIMAM, we are proud to host the annual CIMAM conference 2014. Our languages and cultures may be different but we share a common vision within CIMAM: that modern and contemporary art museums have been built as institutional tools that share knowledge and education with society. At Mathaf we place art from the Arab world at the core of our programmes. We also focus on education as a key mission in our exhibitions. We champion the work of artists from this region, and through our local partnerships with Qatar's Ministry of Culture and the thriving art galleries that support this development. We bring art from all around the world to inspire, influence and equip aspiring artists from the region and to educate our communities in international art.

Mathaf's collection began with the Qatar Foundation acquiring the collection of His Excellency Sheikh Hassan bin Mohammed bin Ali Al Thani, an accomplished artist himself. His collection formed the starting point of the National Collection of Modern and Contemporary Arab Art. This building used to be a school and this performance venue is to be the site of the Al-Jazeera Children's Channel. So we continue to reuse and recycle old buildings to nurture artists and creative communities. Last night we opened the exhibition of works by Shirin Neshat, who's with us this morning, and last week we opened an exhibition of our permanent collection, called *Summary Part I*, which if you haven't yet seen, I'm sure you will.

Mathaf works closely with our students. Our programmes focus on engaging and building audiences through various forms of collaboration. Mathaf is also moving into its next phase of expansion, as we prepare to extend our building to support our ongoing activities. Through our diverse exhibition programmes we are initiating networks both within and across our region and the rest of the world. I encourage you all to take part in our conference and activities. The cultural offers here are unlimited, between the Museum of Islamic Art in Qatar and our thriving art galleries, there is a lot of art, architecture and public art to see and appreciate. I take this opportunity to thank everyone involved in making this conference happen, from our professional staff to our committed volunteers.

Thank you very much for being here and I hope that you have a fruitful conference. I look forward to meeting you during your stay. Thank you very much. [Applause]

---

Abdellah Karroum: Thank you, Excellency. Now I am pleased to invite Anne-Catherine Robert-Hauglustaine, General Director of ICOM.

Anne-Catherine Robert-Hauglustaine: Her Highness Sheikha Al Mayassa bint Hamad bin Khalifa Al-Thani, His Excellency Sheikh Hassan bin Mohammed bin Ali Al-Thani, dear President of CIMAM Bartomeu Marí, dear colleagues of ICOM and CIMAM. It's a great honour for me to be present here with you in this wonderful Mathaf Museum in Doha, Qatar. On behalf of our president, Professor Dr Hans-Martin Hinz, President of ICOM, I would like to stress the good relationship that we have now between ICOM and CIMAM. Our museum world is changing; we are challenged by colleagues coming from other horizons to work together in a rich and positive collaboration. Public versus private is, in a way, maybe an old-fashioned vision. Public with private, in the sphere of the museum, is the topic we are all dealing with, especially these days at the CIMAM conference. CIMAM is a leading association in this field, and ICOM will be involved in the thinking, the reflection and the progress that will be made during this conference and afterwards regarding this crucial topic for our common future.

We all have in mind our code of ethics, that has been published and displayed by ICOM, but we now need to work on a new normative instrument for museums and collections, and this is related to UNESCO. We need a global approach, we need a collaboration action plan for the future, and I'm willing to start it here and now. Thank you very much. [Applause]

---

Abdellah Karroum: Thank you. Now I'm pleased to invite Bartomeu Marí, President of CIMAM.

Bartomeu Marí: Good morning. As President of CIMAM and on behalf of the members of the board of this institution, I'd like to welcome you to Doha.

This year's meeting is hosted by Mathaf, the Arab Museum of Modern Art, one of the most prominent institutions in Qatar and certainly of the region. We're delighted to hold this 2014 Annual Conference for the first time in the Gulf region. I would like to express our deepest gratitude to Her Excellency Sheikha Al Mayassa bint Hamad bin

Khalifa Al-Thani, His Excellency Sheikh Hassan bin Mohammed bin Ali Al-Thani, and His Highness Sheikh Abdullah bin Nasser bin Khalifa Al-Thani for their support and hospitality. Qatar museums are an incredible partner to whom we express our gratitude. We extend our gratitude for allowing us to visit this great city in a privileged atmosphere. We are also very very grateful to Abdellah Karroum, Director of Mathaf, who has been deeply committed and involved in the year-long preparation of this event, and especially to his staff. It's been a real pleasure to organise this meeting with the Mathaf team.

I would also like to thank the Getty Foundation, the Fundación Cisneros, Colección Patricia Phelps de Cisneros, and Qatar Museum for their involvement and generous donations and grants as a result of which over thirty professionals from countries in emerging economies—Latin America, the Gulf region and the Middle East—have been able to join this conference. Finally, we're very thankful also to all the institutions, galleries and museums that have opened their doors especially for us these days. Last but not least, I would like to express our appreciation of the renewed support that ICOM, through the assertive presidency of Professor Dr Hans-Martin Hinz and the energy of Director General Anne-Catherine Robert-Hauglustaine, is giving in this new impulse of the relationship with CIMAM.

In relation to its subject, CIMAM's 2014 conference raises discussions and focuses studies on the effects of global changes, of technological, economic, political and social transformations in the institutional environments in which we live, and seeks to develop arguments for museums to adapt their original missions in keeping with these institutional ethics, challenges and realities. We have brought together an outstanding group of speakers with wide experience and expert knowledge. We would like to thank everyone for coming from such a long way. I think we have three very intense days ahead of us, and I hope everyone enjoys very much taking part in this meeting. Thank you all very much. [Applause]

---

# What Is Public Interest Today?

Frances Morris: Well, we're almost there so maybe we should begin.

My name is Frances Morris and I'm a board member of CIMAM. In fact I'm a new board member, so this is the first CIMAM conference I've been involved in, and it's been a pleasure. I just thought that in addition to all the thanks that were given earlier it would be very nice to thank the CIMAM team, and in particular Jenny and Inés, who are based in Spain but who have done a huge amount of advanced preparation for this conference. My own view is that it already seems to be an exemplary conference. We've made a great start and I'm looking forward very much to the next two and a half days.

So this is the second session this morning, and those of you who've read your notes will know that today we're thinking about issues of public interest. In particular, what constitutes our public? Is our public equal to our audiences? And looking at ideas around public trust, what do we consider the role of the museum, its responsibilities and its duties? We've already had some of those ideas coming through Hito's brilliant and inspirational paper this morning, and now we have four short papers, four short perspectives from professionals within the art world, each of whom will be speaking for around twenty minutes. After their papers I'm

going to ask all of them to come and share the platform and we'll have a Q&A session, so if you can make a note of your questions as they speak, then I think we can have a really good integrated discussion before lunch.

We're going to start by hearing from Graham Beal. Graham is a British-born curator. His professional life began in Sheffield and then he moved on to be the second chief curator at the Sainsbury Centre for Visual Arts in East Anglia, but his subsequent career has mostly taken place in the United States. He's been chief curator and director at a number of American institutions, and most notably he's been the director of the Detroit Institute of Arts. The recent economic and social history of Detroit is known to us all, and his museum and his role in addressing that situation has been pivotal. I know that originally he was just going to talk about his collection display, and how that has engaged with audiences, but I think today he's going to give us a broader focus, a broader account of how what he's done with the museum has not only impacted on the experiences of his audiences, but the experience and ... what's the word? ... the experience and trauma of Detroit itself. So it's a great pleasure to introduce Graham Beal and give him the floor.

---

## Perspective 1

# Graham Beal

*Biography:* Born in Stratford-on-Avon, Graham Beal has degrees in English and Art History from the University of Manchester and London University's Courtauld Institute of Art. He began his museum career at Sheffield City Art Galleries, moving to the U. S. in 1973, and working for Washington University in St. Louis as Art Gallery Director. In 1977 Beal became Chief Curator at the Walker Art Center in Minneapolis. In 1983 he returned to England as Director of the Sainsbury Centre for Visual Arts. He returned to the U. S. as Chief Curator at the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art in 1984. In 1989 he became Director of the Joslyn Art Museum in Omaha, Nebraska and, in 1999, Director of the Detroit Institute of Arts.

Graham Beal has organised over forty exhibitions. His publications include volume 1 of the *Robert and Lisa Sainsbury* collection and a book on the history of American painting in the collection. He was a member of the Federal Advisory Committee on International Exhibitions from 1991–1995; a Trustee of the Association of Art Museum Directors from 2002–2005; and a Trustee of the American Association of Museums from 2003–2006. He was awarded an honorary doctorate by the College for Creative Studies in 2008.

Thank you Frances. Good morning.

As Frances said, I'm going to try to broaden my presentation, so it may be a little bit scrappy, jumping backwards and forwards. First a little bit of history, because this is vital. In 1885 the Detroit Museum of Art opened. It had, as many museums did when they started in the States, financial issues, problems, supported by the usual captains of industry, city fathers, that sort of thing. But to solve these financial problems, when the city of Detroit was really booming after World War One, they decided to make the museum a city department, and a private museum transferred ownership of everything—building, land and collection—to the city of Detroit. In the nineteen twenties this seemed like a fantastic idea. Here's a sample of the collections that were being put together. The DIA was the first American museum, public museum, to buy a Van Gogh, the first public museum to buy a Matisse. It was a very very forward-looking institution and at the same time they were acquiring works ...

Slide. Second from the top is our great Brueghel, one of two in the United States, and above that is the Master of Osservanza with what is said to be the first sunrise in Western art. We have an African collection, great Native American collections, great American collections. It's an extraordinary group of works of art that were put together, starting in the twenties, and then being built on really through the fifties and sixties. We continue to have a sizeable endowment for art acquisition, about five million dollars a year, which is sizeable for most American museums.

But when the museum really established itself, put together by the American collectors in the early part of the first decade of the twentieth century, this is when American art museums really took on their character, a combination of wealthy art collectors who are connoisseurs and a new breed of scholars imported from Europe called art historians. One of those was William Valentiner, the great Rembrandt scholar who came to Detroit. He was behind acquiring the Van Gogh and the Matisse, and most of the works I've just pointed out. And the standard when installing these American museums was according to those principles: principles of connoisseurship and principles of art history.

Certainly, I as a curator—I've been at it now, as a curator and director, for forty-one years—have spent a lot of my time trying to persuade people, the general public, that Baroque art is very very

interesting, and that Neoclassical art is very interesting, and defining terms, trying to get people to understand terminology.

Slide. This is a slide of Everett Austin, a very important director-curator in the history of the American museum. Alfred Barr, with some truth, said that he was actually more important than he had been! He was a young man in 1927 and he'd been at the Wadsworth Atheneum Museum and he'd brought in, in 1927, exhibitions of Picasso, of Joan Miró, of Salvador Dalí, and attendance had gone up enormously. At the annual board meeting, with his group of wealthy patrons sitting around the table, he started talking about how many people had been coming to the museum. He was in full flow, this many thousand, that many thousand, and a voice came from somewhere around the table saying, 'But Mr Austin, do we really want all of those people charging through our museum?' The 'our' museum—there was the ownership of the museum, it belonged to the founders.

By the same token, you can see that Everett himself, 'Chick' himself, felt rather possessive of art, and on another occasion, when he was asked what the purpose of an art museum was, his answer was 'To amuse the director'. So those are the tensions you get: on the one hand we're saying 'We're for the public', and on the other hand we're saying 'We're specialists, we know about art and we'll teach you about art'.

Slide. I'm going to go way forward now. This is a reconstruction of a page from our award-winning guidebook of the mid-nineties. You can see there's a quote there, that says that 'Led by Robert Henri, the men of the so-called Ash Can School treated themes new to American art: the streets and tenements of the city. This approach to art was shocking to some and deplorable to others.' That is absolutely true, that is what the art history books tell us. So that's what we tell people because that's why the Ash Can School had its very very brief moment of art historical glory. The trouble is that not one of those paintings that we have of the Ash Can School actually represents what we're saying that the Ash Can School was important for. Even this piece at the bottom left here, *McSorley's Bar*, the artist of that painting John Sloane said 'if all bars had conducted themselves with the same decorum as McSorley's Bar, prohibition would never have been possible.' So even that painting doesn't fit what it looks like. This is a slight caricature, but this is what we'd been doing, we'd been teaching history of art. Those of us

who trained in history of art think that it's a great window on the world, but the research that we have done—and we've done extensive research—shows that it is not how you get people to connect with art. It is not how we went into art in the first place—I'm a failed painter so I became an art historian! It was another way of looking at art. There are many ways of looking at art.

So when we came to reinstall our huge collection of six thousand works of art in fifteen thousand square metres of space I put together three teams that became four, drawn together from across the whole staff, and these individuals worked with the curators and educators over eighteen months to draw out the stories that they found interesting from their collections. And those were the stories that were developed through these teams. I asked the teams to think of two questions: Why did this object exist? What was the human need for this work of art, for this thing? And then secondly, a little more difficult actually, Why is it in the DĪA? It's a question of values.

Slide. This is a sketch from one of the sessions that we were in, not just thinking about style and art history but thinking about the global conditions, the kind of ways in which individual civilisations come together by bumping shoulders (sometimes it's rather more aggressive than that) with other cultures, things like trade and war. Here's a page from one of the team leader's books. We came up with about three hundred different ideas, which we whittled down to about ninety, with a number left over for us to work on in the future. And when we got our ideas together, because by this time, nobody had seen a thing yet, but we were being accused of dumbing down, and Disneyfication. We brought in experts from around the world, literally, to stay for two or three days, go over the material and make sure that everything was current, because the last thing we wanted in a dumbed-down museum, which everyone assumed we would be, would be to deliver out of date information.

And then we did a huge amount of work on the visitor. Paralleling each of the staff teams was a group of visitors.

Slide. There are two jokes there I'll have to pass over. We had these teams put together by a third party, individuals who'd rarely or never come to the DĪA. They volunteered; we gave them dinner and we gave them a year-long free membership to the museum. We sat down and we took these teams through our ideas, with slides and with exercises in galleries. We didn't ask them for ideas, we asked them how effective are we being in getting these ideas across. And at the same time we gave them games to play. You probably can't see it but at the top it says 'Interesting', 'Not interesting'; at the bottom, 'Familiar', 'Not familiar'. This work here, a

tiny ivory by David Marchand, we'd just paid (over ten years ago) \$ 365,000 for a work of art that a visitor found neither of interest nor very familiar [Laughter]. It didn't do very well in this one either. That didn't mean that we were going to stop buying this kind of art; it meant we knew it was going to be much harder to convey why these were important than other pieces. Some slides are missing there.

The ideas that we developed, we could give fancy names to them but because we were asking why these objects exist, they all came down to shared human experiences. This is a very good example, our Italian eighteenth-century collection had been displayed, as we all know: Baroque, Rococo, Neoclassicism. It had fabulous, enormous altarpieces in the big gallery and somewhere in the middle there, looking very very lonely was a single Rococo Italian cabinet, that didn't really relate to any of the paintings except that it was painted at the same time. But if you asked the question why do these objects exist, many of those paintings and sculptures exist because they were acquired by wealthy individuals on the Grand Tour, nine to eighteen months, in Italy finishing their education. They're souvenirs, basically. Everybody knows what it's like to go on vacation; everyone knows what it's like to want to have a souvenir to remember that pleasant experience by. So that is where we start. We start with the knowledge, with the information that visitors bring with them, and then we build on that.

Slide. When you look at these various things, those fancy names on one side, that on the other come down to very basic shared human experiences. These are three objects from our French eighteenth-century collection, Baroque, Rococo, Neoclassicism. This was made in Paris for Catherine the Great and was once on the ceremonial passage from the old Hermitage. It was sold by Stalin and bought by a local collector in Detroit, Anna Thompson Dodge, of the Dodge car company. So, why do these objects exist? Well, they exist because they were made for very wealthy people who didn't have very much to do (well, a few did, they were involved with government), and so they ritualised their day. That's basically what they did: they would get dressed in the morning, they would have parties, *veillées*, and then in the evening they would sit down to maybe a fourteen or a fifteen-course meal.

Slide. And here's a shot from a studio in New York where we're making a video that's going to go into the galleries. I'd like to point out that we saved a lot of money on costumes because we only needed the arms [Laughter]. What we do is we show three courses of one of these meals. You sit down at the table, or you stand around it, you touch a button and you get this five-minute presentation. The object that was in the middle of the last slide is there, in the

panoramic view, and the candlesticks on the table are back there. So people could look at this, and then turn around and look at the objects, and understand that these are not just fantasy things that stood on someone's mantelpiece to fill up a gap; they were used, they were how people ritualised. This is like a Thanksgiving dinner, as you'd say in America, a formal meal with lots of rules attached to it. And, of course, some of the critical descriptions made the new museum with its interactive displays sound like a pinball alley! I show this slide because I think it's not too terribly intrusive and an expert walking in there wouldn't be unduly disturbed or have his meditations interrupted by that particular table.

We also discovered that the American public, generally speaking, does not read more than a hundred and fifty words, so if you want to make a point you'd better get it across within a hundred and fifty words. The point of our labels is not to give people information as much as to make them look back, look at the works of art for themselves. So we make suggestions, bullet points of the kind of things that the gallery will be dealing with.

Slide. Here's an example of a story that came out of the collection. Sorry, you can't see. We have four Picassos, all portraits of his friends, and here we have a bank of photographs. Visitors are asked to match these photographs with the portraits and in doing so we get them to look back at the painting. And in doing so we also get them to begin to understand that Picasso was not doing stuff that a child of six could do; that these were actually portraits, that there were connections between the character and the appearance of each of those individuals.

Slide. Then we have things like this Eye Spy. These are mounted lower down for children, and they go and look for these objects. Why were we so concerned about this? I had long-standing professional concerns. Detroit is the ultimate un-tourist town; 1% of our audience comes from around the world, 80% of our audience comes from three counties, so if we can't get the people from three counties to come back, we don't have much of an audience. So the whole point of this was to make the museum a place where you came, you engaged on your terms, you slowed down, you didn't do the whole of the museum in forty-five minutes and check the museum off as being done for the year, but you engaged—you saw a small part of the museum, and we hope that you'll want to come back because you enjoyed it enough. We want to get people to talk to one another: families, groups of people who share the same values, giving them a little bit of information, getting them talking about these objects, we learned, is one of the crucial factors.

I should say, although there are a couple of slides that I skipped, that while we were doing all this work over a four-year period we had two

full-time evaluators in the galleries doing various different kinds of tests: we came up with three panels describing Abstract Expressionism and then we asked people to comment on them, so as much work in interpretation and education went into this as curatorial expertise.

Slide. We also went out of the museum. This is a programme called Inside Out, where we took reproductions—we stole this idea from the National Gallery of London—and we put pictures, reproductions, in surprising places. This is Detroit's Coliseum, the defunct railroad station. For the first couple of years we had to do a lot of work; by the third year, this programme that was affecting twenty townships every year was run entirely by that slight young woman down there, because by that time we had the arts groups of the communities engaged. We have communities lining up—we thought that this would go on for three years or so and people would get bored, but we have communities lined up for 2017 to be part of our Inside Out programme.

These are high-quality reproductions. Thirty years ago, as a curator, I would have said 'You can't send out reproductions like that representing the museum, you've got to get people into the museum!' Well, that's what this does; to a large extent, it gets people to come into the museum. It also makes them feel that the DIA has reached out to them.

The DIA has chronic financial problems. Because we were in a very difficult state we decided we had to have a tax passed in 2012. Everybody knows how much Americans like paying taxes. People thought we were crazy, but polls told us that the community by now felt enough ownership with the museum that a tax would pass. And it did; it passed resoundingly in two counties, and we have financial stability for the first time in forty years, and we've also reached out...

Slide. There are the headlines, that's me and my chairman on the election night. I was rather more joyful than I was on the recent election night!

Slides. Here we have the kind of programmes that we're now doing: paying for all of the school buses for the three counties, for them to bring their children in; paying for coaches to bring senior citizens and others; carrying out programmes with victims of Alzheimer's, Iraq veterans with closed head injuries, and working with the Children's Hospital, taking the museum to them.

Well, the money that was passed in the tax comes to an organisation called the Detroit Institute of Arts Inc. that I work for. We run the museum for the city, we're not a public institution. But this meant that when the emergency manager came in and decided that he might sell the collection, to sell the collection he would have to cancel the contract with the private organisation; when that contract is cancelled, the money stops coming from the tax, and

the museum closes, so his hands were tied, to a large extent. The reinstallation that had led to the election became an important component in the strategy that the emergency manager had to pursue when he was trying to find ways to sell the Detroit city debt. And we all now know that in the end we all became good friends. A brilliant judge and lawyer came up with a wonderful way of finding ways of raising money. We're raising a hundred million; eight hundred million dollars to repair the pensions, because that's all that people really cared about, the fact that the pensioners were going to suffer.

So the collection has turned out to be something that has raised the profile of the museum, made people feel that it really did belong to them, and it was on Friday, as I was in the airport lounge, waiting to get on the plane to come here, that the judge made his ruling that effectively said that the DIA's collection is a public trust and therefore cannot be sold under American law. Thank you very much. [Applause]

Frances Morris: Graham, thank you. That was inspirational. Of course, one of the problems of having twenty-minute slots is that when we have a speaker like Graham, who has an incredible story to tell, it's rather collapsed, but there will be time for questions.

Our second speaker is also somebody who has an incredible history. Maria Lind is known I'm sure to anybody and everybody who has worked as a curator, or been interested in curatorial practice, because she is not only a practitioner but she is also well known as a writer and lecturer, and her practice is very much a living experimentation with her ideas, so there's a close connection between her teaching, her theoretical writing and her work, currently at Tentsa Konsthall in Stockholm, a suburban art centre which is conducting a really, interesting experimental programme with international artists, collaborators and local audiences. But she's not going to speak about that this morning, she's going to stand a little aside from her own work as a curator and talk about the subject that is the topic for the day: public good, funding structures, forms of governance, the professional art sector, what we understand by the public good. And so, without saying anything further, I'm delighted to introduce and hand over to Maria Lind.

---

## Perspective 2

# Maria Lind

Biography: Maria Lind is a curator and critic based in Stockholm, where she was born in 1966 and is currently Director of Tensta Konsthall. From 1997 to 2001 she was curator at Moderna Museet also in Stockholm and in 1998 co-curated Manifesta 2, the European contemporary art biennial. As head of the Moderna Museet Projekt, Lind worked with artists on a series of twenty-nine commissions that developed in a temporary project-space, either within or beyond the museum in Stockholm. Among the artists were Koo Jeong A, Simon Starling, Jason Dodge and Esra Ersen. In 2000 she curated *What If: Art on the Verge of Architecture and Design* for the same space, in collaboration with Liam Gillick. From 2002 to 2004 she directed the Kunstverein München where, together with a curatorial team, she ran a programme involving artists such as Deimantas Narkevicius, Oda Projesi, Annika Eriksson, Bojan Sarcevic, Philippe Parreno and Marion Von Osten. From 2005 to 2007 she was Director of Iaspis in Stockholm, and between 2008 and 2010 she directed the graduate programme at the Center for Curatorial Studies of Bard College. She has contributed widely to newspapers and magazines and to numerous catalogues and other publications. Lind is co-editor of the books *Curating with Light Luggage: Reflections, Discussions and Revisions* and *Collected Newsletter* (both with Revolver Archiv für aktuelle Kunst), and *The Greenroom: Reconsidering the Documentary and Contemporary Art* (Sternberg Press). She has also published *Taking the Matter into Common Hands: On Contemporary Art and Collaborative Practices* (Black Dog Publishing), *European*

*Cultural Policies 2015: A Report with Scenarios on the Future of Public Funding for Contemporary Art in Europe* (Iaspis and eipcp). Recent co-edited publications include *Contemporary Art and Its Commercial Markets: A Report on Current Conditions and Future Scenarios*, and *Performing the Curatorial: Within and Beyond Art*, (both Sternberg Press). In 2009 she received the Walter Hopps Award for Curatorial Achievement, and in autumn 2010 Sternberg Press published *Selected Maria Lind Writings*.

## Bye-Bye Detachment: On the Consequences of the Separation of Brains and Muscles in the Art World

Thank you very much Frances, and thank you Graham. Extremely interesting, and I'm sure we have things to discuss later: What is an audience? And what is a public?

Where do revolutions happen nowadays? In the streets, is the most immediate answer: Ontario Square, Zuccutti Park and more recently on Maidan Square. But just as often they happen behind closed doors, far away from the visibility of outdoor public space and the presumed transparency of democratic decision-making. In fact, some of the most profound revolutions take place where television cameras are absent and iPhones are placed just out of reach, or are not even present, at board meetings and of the desks of bureaucrats and managers.

A revolutionary plan that changed the course of both the economy and politics in Sweden was shaped on 21 November 1985 in a villa in the countryside near Stockholm. The board of the Central Bank of Sweden met there in order to come to terms with the weakening economy, decreasing profits for the industry, and increasing unemployment defining that period. The board's solution was to make the bank sector autonomous by deregulating the credit market, an initiative endorsed by Olof Palme's social democratic government of the time (this was just three months before he was shot and killed in the street in Stockholm in February 1986). As we know today, such decisions about the credit market have been major factors in global economic developments in recent decades. In turn, this has affected the world of art in profound ways, both fuelling the boom of the commercial art market and pushing the public art sector towards budget cuts and increased instrumentalisation. For example, demands on integration, crime prevention, learning, job creation, etc.

This unspectacular and largely unknown albeit radical event on 21 November 1985 is the object of the artist Andjeas Ejiksson's work, *1985*. The work takes the shape of a play featuring the characters who took part in the board meeting, and was conceived as a site-specific performance for the villa itself and its surrounding picturesque landscape. *1985* was commissioned in 2011 by Lisa

Rosendahl, then director of Iaspis, the international artists' studio programme in Sweden, which itself is part of a state authority, the Arts Grants Committee, and falls directly under the influence of the Ministry of Culture. That the influence of bureaucracy has been growing rapidly since the advent of new public management in Western Europe is palpable in most sectors of society, whether the impact is revolutionary or not. The term 'new public management' was coined in the early nineties by Christopher Hood, a specialist in the study of executive government regulation and public sector reform in order to describe the shift from the so-called progressive public administration. Since the beginning of the twentieth century, public progressive administration instigated a division between public and private activities, and introduced procedures such as the arm's-length principle to avoid corruption and nepotism. Neo-liberal market solutions based on economic rationalism are central to the new public management methodology and, generally speaking, focus has moved from the process to the result. Administrators have become more like managers, and whereas the public sector was historically understood as being democratically governed, having attractive goals and a functioning juridical system, it is now dominated by business models where efficiency, competition and control are loadstars.

In the public sector and elsewhere, the principle of serving has been increasingly taken over by that of steering, although the increase in responsibility which comes with steering is typically not followed by an equal amount of real influence. And as part of this, it can even be argued that art and culture are going through paradigmatic changes in many parts of the world. Both funding structures and forms of governance and assessment are increasingly dominated by beliefs and mechanisms taken from the corporate sector. Funding is openly instrumentalised in very many places, in terms of public sources, private donations and foundation money, and even bureaucrats require treatment of the kind that used to be reserved for private donors. The smooshing factor is something to reckon with

within the public sector these days as well.

At the same time, more and more people encounter art, at art fairs and mainstream museums, the former now having a long history of catering to professional art sector's need for lectures, panel discussions and even workshops. Simultaneously, phenomena which used to be clearly separated now appear evermore entangled with one another, like the public and the private; there is a problematic pattern emerging, that has to do with the division that these developments create—namely, the forking of paths with at least two streams, the majors and the minors, the mainstream and the tributaries, or the muscles and the brains, if you wish. Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari developed the notion of becoming minor as a critique of the notion of majority and minority in ordinary language and their attachment to the idea of claiming identities. Bearing Kafka in mind, who neither felt comfortable with the pro-Jews nor with the dominant Austro-Hungarian power structure, the philosophers' claim 'becoming minor' as an ethical choice is not necessarily connected to the numerical size of a group but to a relational difference between majors and minors. On the schoolyard of contemporary art, this can be translated as the brains and the muscles: those who have and use physical strength and resources and are therefore, with their basic approach, able to reach out to wider circles, dominate them and decide the overall rules of the game, and those who actually invent the new games and find the settings for them, but who do not have the power to become widely influential.

So, what does this forking of paths mean for art institutions which understand themselves as art and artists-centred, who want to rely on producing public good for citizens, or simply want to become a common? And here the question is also what it would mean to shift some of the terms of the discussion in general, and of our conference. To shift the terms from public and private to profit and non-profit, but maybe even further; to start to think about the commons as a way of sharing but also as a way of actually starting to question property relations.

Without speaking directly for Cluster, the discussions that the Cluster participants have had were in my mind when I was putting this paper together. Cluster is a network of eight contemporary visual arts organisations that are each located in residential areas on the peripheries of cities, with organisations extending from Europe to the Middle East, and one member of the network in Holon (Israel). Although different in size and structure, each organisation is focused on commissioning, producing and presenting contemporary art in an art and artists-centred manner, and the nature of the work is often experimental, process-driven and

involving research. The organisations' programming tends to be based on working with international and local artists, and often engages with diverse individuals and groups on local levels. They have been described as runways, being uniquely well connected on various levels, globally and locally, and other levels in between, and they are more and more rare cases of a physical place of encounters and debate as part of civil society.

Cluster was initiated in June 2011 in order to facilitate internal and public exchange of knowledge about how these types of institutions function and, secondarily, to establish further collaborations between them, but it was really crucial first to actually get to know each other in detail. In addition to this, the long-term goal is to collaborate between the network, to increase awareness of the institutions' and organisations' work and to focus on the importance of the outcome. And one of the things that the Cluster network has done collectively is a publication: this one, which is called *Cluster: Dialectionary*. I will pass it around later and you can take a look. It aims to find new ways to position the network's activities and, more broadly, the work of contemporary visual arts organisations, particularly in relation to wider social, political and cultural concerns. There are very interesting essays by, for example, Andrea Phillips, Mark Fisher and Nina Möntmann, and the artist Marion von Osten, and there's also a set of keywords that might be useful, compiled through the work of these different institutions by the people involved—artists, curators and other people engaged with the projects. Examples of such keywords are emancipation, energy and estrangement.

Slides. This is just to give you a little insight into who these people are and what we've been doing when we've been travelling. There's a website as well. We have here a neck dilemma of presentations (when you don't have the screen in front of view and you have to keep turning your neck all the time), so please excuse me.

One effect of the aforementioned paradigmatic changes is that many of us, through our organisations, are tied up in a situation where we have to juggle public and private fund-raising in order both to generate income and diversify our funding sources. The boom of the commercial art market since the late nineteen nineties might not directly pertain to us, but indirectly we're deeply affected by the overall changes in the field of art, including funding.

We're also dealing with new forms of governance, and in addition to being responsible for the artistic programme in our institutions we're faced with the prominent feature in this process, at least in north-western Europe, the ever-present and impressive volume of reviews, assessments and

controls of different kinds. I suspect that many of you are quite familiar with all this. We count, weigh and measure more or less everything, and evaluate the results. The protocols for doing so go by various names: review, inspection, certification, revision and quality control are some of them. The field of contemporary art is as affected by this as any other field, as we know from healthcare and education. It is felt both in how art works, and in how organisations operate. But in contrast to art historian Benjamin Buchloh's notion of the administration of aesthetics, describing the attitude of Conceptual Art towards procedures or bureaucracy, it is more to do with methodology, protocols and rituals than with aesthetics in a classical sense. It is the performance of bureaucracy and management. All of this amounts to an accelerated formalism in terms of reviewing and assessing. But why do we review and assess so much today? And what are the consequences? One explanation has to do with so-called organisation making. For example, over the last twenty years or so the public sector in Sweden has undergone a process through which agencies and other entities have strived to become proper organisations in the sense of becoming generally known and accounted for. And then, understandably, it is necessary to be definable, measurable and manageable, characteristics that come from steering mechanisms borrowed from business management. In addition to this there has been, in a place like Sweden, a tendency to decentralise, which has led to responsibility moving downwards in the hierarchy. Reviews and assessments are useful for making sure that this freedom is not used in the wrong way, or for attempting to prevent disorder. So this is a descriptive use: unless you inspect and assess, problems might occur, so you'd better take care of that yourself. But as we know, reviews and assessments often lead to a demand for more, and presumably better, reviews and assessments, and they then become an instrument of control, a tool for pre-emptively making people do what you want them to do. The idea of numbers works really well also with the idea of transparency, which is the new doctrine. Perhaps we don't talk as much about objectivity anymore but transparency is a buzzword. When this logic of assessment tries to dominate over other logics, for example professional logics specific to each field of activity, an imaginary rationality emerges. This is especially true when the reviewers and assessors can implement sanctions. As reviewers and assessors can rarely delve into the activities themselves, they have to rely on reports, which, in turn, make the bureaucracy grow by stimulating rituals of control. However, reviews and assessments are often made too narrowly to amount to the real learning experiences, and the new

knowledge which they might produce doesn't really enter the relevant arenas. So at the end of the day, real change in organisations happens through established power relations and ideology, not through reviews and assessments. And yet, whereas politicians tend to hang on to the idea that reviews and assessments signal action and engagement, they are in fact replacing political responsibility. The society of reviewing and assessing has, in and of itself, revolutionised everything from the shape of the workday of many a civil servant to how activities in the public sector are understood. So at stake here is value, and a clash between different kinds of value, such as economic value, public value and deferred value. We are not likely to be able to evade cultural assessments, but we can try and change the amount of evaluations and the terms according to which we as art institutions are being valued. Therefore values as such come to the foreground, especially the kind of values that can account for—and be sensitive to—art and its specificity. The concept of public value can for example be useful as an alternative, based on quality, to the kind of quantifiable values on which a lot of public management now rely. The notion of public value was developed by the political scientist Mark H. Moore in the early nineties as an equivalent to the shareholders value model in the corporate sphere, but repurposed for the public sector something which contributes to the common good in ways which cannot necessarily be measured in monetary terms.

The historian of ideas Sven-Eric Liedman has identified a dangerous phenomenon as part of all of this that is at play, namely pseudo-quantities, the flourishing of which within new public management he firmly warns against. According to Liedman, a pseudo-quantity is a quality that can be more accurately described verbally than it can be in material or concrete terms, either through description or more expressively. Pseudo-quantities come in two different forms, simple and composite, which are equally deceptive. Simple pseudo-quantities are, for instance, stars following the review of a film; composite pseudo-quantities are slightly more complex, such as university rankings, where a number of criteria such as amounts of articles written, quantity of citations attributed and Nobel Prizes won filter into a grading system whose precision is just illusionary. The conflict here is between quantification and well-grounded judgements about complicated and complex areas such as education and healthcare, and art, as the former has subsumed the latter. Language is simply replaced by numbers and this is contrary to what Mikael Löfgren states as an urgent necessity in the recent report 'No Exceptions' about the working value of small and medium-sized visual art institutions across Sweden. Lergian concludes that

we need to develop languages with which we can articulate and make public use of the specific and unique value of art. This report for now only exists in Swedish and was commissioned by the national network Klister, which has twenty members from across the country.

The notion of deferred value is yet another useful concept, particularly for small-scale arts organisations such as the Cluster network when it comes to tackling some of the complexities of working with contemporary art. One of its participants, The Showroom, is part of London's advocacy group Common Practice that commissioned the report in which the notion of deferred value was introduced. The report came out in 2011 titled 'Size Matters: Notes towards a Better Understanding of the Value, Operation and Potential of Small Visual Arts Organisations', and its author argues that organisation such as The Showroom are crucial components to the arts ecology. By working with emerging and not yet confirmed artists, and by testing new curatorial and educational methods, these 'brains' specialise in generating artistic, social and societal values which are almost always palpable up to twenty years after the projects have taken place. By that time it's the mainstream institutions and the commercial sector, the 'muscles' that benefit from the desired but deferred values. Despite their lack of scope or funding for development, these smaller organisations take considerable but necessary risks by working in this way, and yet the matrix of most funding bodies, including governments, don't properly account for it. So just as the cultural economist Pier Luigi Sacco has shown in his research, that on macro-levels it is not whether money is spent on culture which matters most, whether a city or a region is flourishing, but how it's been done, it's more crucial to consider here how assessing and reviewing is carried out than whether it is done at all. Today, as arts organisations we cannot evade the ever-growing presence of assessment and reviews, but we can insist on other values and therefore other qualities than those typically demanded from us and perhaps, as I said before, also reduce the amount. And I see some of this being debated and put forth among the new networks which have been established over the last few years. Cluster is one of them, Klister is another, but also L'Internationale with members such as MACBA, the Van ABernard Blistèneemuseum and Moderna galerija, the network How To Work Together in London with The Showroom, Chisenhale Gallery and Studio Voltaire, or another one called After April with CCA Derry-Londonderry, Art in General in New York, and Beirut in Cairo. Most of the participants in these networks can be described as belonging to the brains rather than the muscles. And this is a related dilemma: the growing

separation between content-providers and popularisers. So while on the one hand we're discussing the fluidity of borders and the mixing of private and public, etc., there are also divisions taking place. Although strategies and tactics of withdrawal can be necessary and productive, I believe that now is the moment to connect. Even to mobilise. In any case, autonomy and complete attachment were always an illusion as stakeholders have always been present with more or less strings attached. What is at stake now is the legitimacy of art and the possibility to create a reasonable amount of space to manoeuvre while working with it, and to do so by attaching ourselves to those similar to ourselves, such as the networks mentioned, but also to those that are different. In the struggles over values I think we really need each other: the muscles will be poor without the brains and the brains will be weak without the muscles. So interconnecting between various networks and organisations such as CIMAM, the IKT and the ones that I have already mentioned on matters such as these seems more and more important. In the long run it is also necessary to enter into both an internal and a public discussion on art itself, and to openly debate what art does and how it sits in culture and in society today, and how we want it to sit in culture and society under these rapidly changing conditions.

I just have this one slide and a very short remark.

Slide. What about 1985? How did it go with Andjeas Ejiksson's play? For Ejiksson, much of the above—how bureaucracies and managements become sites of condensed influence and revolutionary power, a force to be reckoned with—is a fertile ground for his work. However, 1985 still waits to be staged. The Arts Grants Committee, through the influence of a high-ranking bureaucrat, suddenly erased the play from the board's agenda of art projects by Iaspis which had to be approved, and approved not by its artistic director who commissioned the work, but by its board, according to the logic of administration today. This makes the context of the commissioning of the play by a state agency (which has gone from being one of the most vivid and artists-centred platforms in Europe in the nineteen nineties to now essentially acting as an organisational shell ruled by bureaucracy) even more interesting in all its banality. Furthermore, Iaspis happens to be the place where in the mid-two thousands, just at the time when new public management was being established in Sweden, the word bureaucracy was banned from official use; it was not to be used in writing or in speaking. As Foucault already taught us, real power always tries to conceal itself. Thank you. [Applause].

Frances Morris: Thank you so much. That was, again, fascinating. Maria began by talking about revolutions on the street and behind closed doors, well we're behind closed doors today and—looking around the auditorium—we are an audience and participants with muscles and brains, content-providers and popularisers. I think we are physically embodying the constituencies that you've been talking about in your paper. Thank you.

So, we now move on to Olav Velthuis, associate professor at the Department of Sociology and Anthropology in Amsterdam. Olav is particularly interested—I suppose in a slightly wider perspective—in the emergence and development of art markets in Brazil, Russia, India and China, so hugely relevant to the topic of this conference. He'll be speaking about subjects very close, I think, to all our concerns as curators, practitioners, critics and collectors. In particular, he's going to talk about the impact of new wealth on the art markets, the impact on prices and projects alongside the shrinking budgets of public museums in the shrinking public sector. Today he's going to specifically focus on parts of the world where institutional building is not so old, and where museums—new museums—have less access to the kind of traditional forms of patronage and public support than those of us in the West have historically enjoyed. So Olav, can I invite you to take your place at the podium? Thank you.

---

## Perspective 3

# Olav Velthuis

*Biography:* Olav Velthuis is Associate Professor at the Department of Sociology and Anthropology of the University of Amsterdam. Before then he worked for several years as a staff reporter on the Dutch newspaper *de Volkskrant*. He is currently studying the emergence and development of art markets in Brazil, Russia, India and China. Velthuis is the author of *Imaginary Economics* (NAi Publishers, 2005) and *Talking Prices. Symbolic Meanings of Prices on the Market for Contemporary Art* (Princeton University Press, 2005), which won the Distinguished Book Award of the American Sociological Association for the best book in economic sociology (2006). Together with Maria Lind of Tensta Konsthall (Stockholm), he edited the book *Contemporary Art and Its Commercial Markets: A Report on Current Conditions and Future Scenarios* (Sternberg Press, 2012). Velthuis's journalistic writings have appeared, among others, in *Artforum*, *The Art Newspaper* and the *Financial Times*. His research on art markets has been cited in international media including *Newsweek*, *Die Zeit*, *Corriere della Sera*, *The Independent*, *Il Sole 24 Ore*, the 'Freakonomics' section of *The New York Times*, and the *Frankfurter Allgemeine Zeitung*. Velthuis was board member of the Netherlands Foundation for Visual Arts, Design and Architecture (Fonds BKVB).

Thank you very much to the organisers for inviting me here. I am going to give an outsider's perspective, having been interested in art markets for two decades now, and seeing museums as part of the market (I'll be talking a little more about that in a second). I might actually say, a little impolitely, that you are my research object more than just my audience! And another disclaimer: just from talks this morning and yesterday, I'm sure what I'm going to say is quite controversial, it's not the way you see the market. You could summarise it by saying that I think people's idea of the art market is a cliché, and that the impact of the market is overstated. So I'm going to do three things basically in this talk. First of all, I'm going to make a couple of qualifications regarding the current boom of the market, its nature and its size. Secondly, I would like to talk about a couple of the effects or impacts of this boom on the public interest, on the public sector. And thirdly, I would like to offer an alternative interpretation of why people are so concerned about the market and its supposed impact on the public sector, and I will do so in terms of moral panic. I guess that's where the provocation lies.

I want to start with a couple of graphs. You may have seen graphs like these. They are price indexes; they depict price developments in the art market. If you read newspapers like *The Wall Street Journal* or the *Financial Times* you're sure to have seen these graphs. They give you a picture of where price developments in the art market are going. And what you see here is a comparison between price developments in the fifteen most important, or most expensive, contemporary artists in the world, and (the green line) the stock market index in New York, the Dow Jones, oh no, sorry, it's S&P, Standard and Poor's 500 Index. And what you see here is basically that the art market has been outperforming the stock market big time. Now, I'm not interested so much in where these lines are going as in the fact that we have become so used to looking at art markets through these graphs. This tells us about the financialisation of art, about art becoming an asset class, art becoming commensurate to the stock markets — for many people active in the market, it's kind of normal to compare art to stocks. By the way, this is not new. And that is a sentence I'm going to say a couple of times, because I think that many things that we think of as new in the market are not new at all. These graphs have been around since the late nineteen sixties and I think people are not aware of this. Sotheby's and *The Times London* newspaper had developed such an index in the nineteen sixties when there was another boom. I think a lot of these kinds of phenomena reoccur with every boom. The same goes for art investment funds — we think of them as very new, a new phenomenon, as a new type of actor in the

market, but they were already there in the nineteen sixties. There were even art investment clubs at the beginning of the twentieth century, investing in Picassos and Braques.

So the basic picture is that prices have been rising steeply, and at the same time, the market for art has been expanding big time, at least that is what we've been thinking. If you look here at the long-term graph you see that the market was of ten billion dollars in the early nineties and now it's of about 65 billion dollars, so there has been a huge expansion of global art market sales. Having said that, these are nominal prices: if you think that a dollar now is worth much less than a dollar was in 1990, let's see what happens if we correct that.

Slide. And then you get this line (the red line), the real development of the art market, so when you take inflation into account you see that the boom is much smaller, the line becomes flatter. If you correct for inflation, there is still a boom but much smaller than we tend to think. Now, one of the explanations for this boom has of course been that there is this massive influx of new wealth from all over the world into art markets. New high-net-worth individuals, as they are called, are starting to buy art and are developing a taste for modern and contemporary art in particular. So that could be one of the main reasons, one of the drivers of growth in the art market. But let's look at this.

Slide. What I did in this graph was to add a third line (the blue line), which is an index of the number of billionaires in the world. The data comes from Forbes. These are not actual figures but again an index, to make it comparable to where the market is going. So what you see in the blue line is that in comparison with 1990, today there are five times as many high-net-worth individuals around the world. What we also see is that this number of high-net-worth individuals has been going up much faster than the art market has, and especially than the red line has. If you compare it to the blue line, the art market is completely flat. So what I like to say, a little bit provocatively, is that when people say that the art market at auction houses and powerful galleries around the world is extremely successful at attracting new wealth to the market, in my opinion they've been doing a very poor job. The number of billionaires has been growing much much faster than the size of the market. So these are just a couple of qualifications about the size of the boom — it's big, but it's not as big if you take inflation into account, if you take global wealth creation into account.

Slide. Now another thing about this boom is that we tend to think of it as an overall boom that impacts the entire market, but that is not the case. It's a very partial boom, a very specific boom, that leads to a small group of people profiting but a very large number — both when you look at artists and

when you look at dealers—not profiting at all. You actually find that dealers all over the world and local art markets have a very hard time keeping their doors open. And the same can be said for artists. What we tend to forget, for instance, is that many artists don't have an active market at all, an active resale market; you will never find their work at auctions, so even if there might be people willing to sell it, they are not able to because there is just not an active market for it. It's a very partial boom, or to put it differently, it introduces this boom, a winner-take-all structure into the market, where a very small of artists and art dealers are making huge profits, and a very large group is not attracting any attention at all. You might also say that a very biased economy of attention is being introduced by this boom into the market.

Or, to put it again differently, what we see here is a changing structure of the market. It's not that there is a boom in itself; it is a market that is increasingly turning towards a pyramid with a very big base, where no profits at all are going, and a very small top, where a lot of profits are going. That is what the boom is like.

Slide. Now I would like to talk about a couple of the supposed effects of this boom on public interest, and this is also where the museums come in. I guess that one of the most important claims that has been made about this boom is that it leads to changing validation and validation structures. Basically, the idea is that people in the institutions decide which art is validated, which art will be more likely to end up in the canon are changing, and they're changing towards the private sector. Collectors are more and more important in deciding who is going to be remembered.

Slide. I think this is put very nicely by German art critic Isabella Graw, who at one point writes in *High Price*, a great book on the art market and on the impact of the boom on the art world, that 'Today, alongside gallerists, collectors and their buying habits influence the process of value creation much more than critics'. And she says critics, but you can think not just critics but curators, museum directors, etc. So a change towards private evaluation procedures, in which what collectors are doing is becoming more important in validating contemporary and modern art.

Now again, I think there are reasons to be sceptical about this. In my own research I do a lot of statistical analysis and compile huge data sets that include prices for contemporary works of art. One of the things that may explain such prices are museums. Is the work of an artist collected by museums? Is it shown in group exhibitions? Is it shown in solo exhibitions? What I find is that in order to understand and explain the prices of contemporary art, what museums are doing still

counts, at least as much now as it did in the past. I don't see a diminishing effect of museums on the market. In other words, when I do a statistical analysis I find that what museums are doing is still hugely important in order to understand the prices of art. I do quantitative research, and carry out a lot of interviews together with a research team. We are currently focusing on the new emerging art markets in the BRIC countries: Brazil, Russia, India and China. I have a couple of post-doctorate researchers and Ph.D. students located in these countries, who are doing dozens (or perhaps hundreds by now) of interviews with artists, art dealers, collectors and representatives from institutions. And what we keep hearing, especially from the collectors, is that they are still extremely keen on looking at what museums are doing, on making sure that the artists that they are collecting have an institutional history, and on becoming board members of these museums, for all kinds of reasons. So what we find both in the quantitative and in the qualitative data is that museums are still hugely important for the validation, not just of artists and the worth of contemporary art, but also of the people who are active in it. Having said that, the fact is (and I'll show you a couple of graphs about this) that particularly in the BRIC countries, there is a balance between public and private institutions.

Slide. The growth of art fairs especially around the world has been astounding. Here you see how from the mid-nineties onwards the number of fairs around the world has expanded.

Slide. And here, in a number of countries, you see the relationship between private galleries (art dealers, basically) and all kinds of non-profit institutions. They are not necessarily governmental institutions, they can be private initiatives as well, but at least they are non-profit. And what you see is how in a country like China, or very strikingly in India, there is this huge disbalance between private galleries and public, or rather non-profit initiatives.

I think it would be fair to say that audiences in countries like China or India, when they see modern and contemporary art, it is very likely to be through a private initiative—at a private dealer, at a private art fair. The role of public institutions in these emerging art markets (and in these emerging art worlds) is much less that we are used to thinking in countries in Europe or in the United States. So there is reason for concern there. But again, these collectors and the dealers themselves are worried about that too. In our interviews, these dealers express their worries about the lack of public development of art worlds. Without really willing it, it's as if they were assuming the role of private patrons.

Slide. The second impact that I would like to talk about is a supposedly growing reliance on private collections. One of the outcomes of the

boom would be that museums these days are increasingly in need of private collectors, not just for building up their collections but also for making exhibitions. This tendency of public museums to show private collections, by the way, is another sign that museums continue to be very important for validation. That private collectors are still so keen on showing their works, part of their collections, in public museums shows how important they are for validation.

Slide. A couple of colleagues of mine did quantitative research on the question of the extent to which public museums are relying on private collections, the extent to which public museums are showing parts of private collections, or these collections in their entirety. My colleagues have found that that is only partially the case. Taking the sample they took in New York—the Whitney, the Metropolitan Museum of Art, the Museum of Modern Art and the Guggenheim—they found that, ‘Despite the decline in governmental funding and the growing concentration of wealth and the rise in the price of art works, the four New York City museums have not indulged actual and potential contributors with a growing share of special exhibits organized around their collections.’ So there might be this impression, the perception that they are increasingly relying on private collections, but in fact, if you look at the statistics, this isn’t the case. Of course, this doesn’t necessarily say much about other countries or about other parts of the United States, but it is an indication at least that more research would be needed in order to make firm claims about this.

Slide. A third effect that I would like to talk about is the idea that the boom has led to a higher velocity of the market; the idea that now, due to financialisation, due to collectors treating art more and more as an asset class, as a speculative investment, the turnover, the rate, the speed with which art is changing hands is increasing. There are, of course, many examples and a lot of discussion about this in the art world and in the media.

Slide. You may have heard of this recent case of a Dutch private collector, Bert Kreuk, who exhibited his private collection in the Gemeentemuseum in The Hague last year, and then just a couple of weeks after the show closed, he sold quite a big part of it at auction. It was hugely controversial! By the way, this summer he’s in another controversy, because he sued Danh Vo for not delivering a piece to this very show, so the judge is deciding whether Kreuk is entitled to damages. What is interesting is that it seems to be exemplary of a different way of treating art and a different way of treating museums, where the model would be: you buy art, you put it in a museum for its validation, and then you resell it quickly in order to make a profit. That’s the picture of what is going on.

Slide. Again, looking at statistical evidence,

the picture is very different. This graph shows the average holding period of young artists whose works are sold at auction. When a work by a young artist, an artist under forty, appears at auction, a Belgian research firm analyses how long it has been in the hands of its collector. Our impression is that that holding period is getting shorter and shorter, but what we see in this graph is that the opposite is happening, the average holding period is actually increasing. In the nineteen eighties (which was another boom period, another period in which art was being financialised) it was much shorter than it is nowadays. The holding period was at its longest when the boom had bust, in the mid-nineteen nineties, but now once again the holding period is not decreasing but increasing. So this is a reason for not taking the discourse on the art market in institutions at face value. I think it’s really important to take a closer look at other types of evidence in order to check how they fit this discourse.

Slide. There’s one final thing that I would like to mention briefly. I’m kind of debunking the first three concerns, but I have another concern and that is the rise of indirect subsidies. What hardly anybody is aware of, and yet I think it should be debated much more, and much more openly, is the replacement of direct subsidies by indirect subsidies. What I mean by this is a substitution of money in the form of public subsidies to institutions with tax cuts and tax credits for private collectors donating works to museums, setting up their own private museums, setting up foundations. There are, of course, many good sides to this, as it’s an incentive for collectors, but we are not aware that a lot of public money is involved, because these are basically taxes that are foregone by the government. Direct subsidies, that usually contemplate accountability procedures by parliaments, are being replaced by indirect subsidies, that are so unaccountable that the tax authorities are not even able to tell us how much money is involved (and I’ve been trying in many countries, including the Netherlands, for a long time); how much money the government doesn’t receive because private collectors get tax breaks on donations, on setting up foundations, on establishing private museums. There are estimates for the United States that the ratio is 1 to 15, so for every dollar of direct subsidy there are fifteen dollars of indirect subsidy. And I think it’s a bit out of guilt about these public subsidy cuts that in many countries, especially in Europe, you see that more luxurious indirect tax schemes are being set up. I think it’s something that should be discussed much more openly.

Slide. So to finish off, there is definitely a rupture due to the boom in the art world, but it’s a rupture confined to a relatively small top circuit of the market. In my opinion, the media has been

paying a lot of attention to that very segment of the market. And because it is so event-driven these days, with the auctions and art fairs that the media love to talk about, something like a moral panic is being created about these changing structures in the market. And I think they are not as different as we perceive them to be. That's where I leave it. [Applause]

---

Frances Morris: Olav, thank you very much. I'm sorry that we sort of ran out of time for moral panic, because we were panicking but not in a moral

way, but maybe we can come back to that in the question time.

We have one last speaker before questions, and we are delighted to share the platform with Rana Sadik. Where are you Rana? Good! I wanted to catch Rana earlier to ask her why she didn't want to be introduced as a collector (so I've said it now), but you are also the Director of MinRASY Projects Kuwait. You are on the board of the Welfare Association, a board member of Ashkal Alwan and Bidoun. And you are somebody who I know has a huge number of projects in her head, somebody who enjoys supporting other people's projects but also making you own. I hope you're going to talk about both sides of the equation. Thank you.

## Perspective 4

# Rana Sadik

*Biography:* Rana Sadik is a board member of the Welfare Association, a board member of Ashkal Alwan, Beirut, and Bidoun. She is also the Director of MinRASY projects. An avid supporter of cultural projects, Sadik's interests are academic, artistic and curatorial. Sadik is a life-long resident of Kuwait. She recently conceived a four-part public space project in Kuwait thematically exploring Palestinians in Kuwait which culminated in the museological project Museum of Manufactured Response to Absence.

Good morning. A thank you, a very quick thank you, to Bartomeu for inviting me to speak on this topic, and definitely to Jenny Schmitz for all your efforts in helping me get here. Bartomeu asked me to speak on the subject of patronage and the construction of a sphere for production and reception of artistic practice. There are two types of patrons in my world: the state-sanctioned patrons for protocol function and management of an event, and the private patrons, individuals who create and support private initiatives. There are no legislative decisions that either encourage or discourage patronage. In some countries, financial incentives and benefits are given to encourage individuals and institutions to venture into the world of patronage for arts and culture.

There is a real lack of understanding of what the role of a patron is and how this can be used to capitalise on that. Patrons are members of the community, usually with influence in certain spheres and rather visible within their communities. This may not necessarily fit into the agenda of state-sanctioned patrons. Sometimes protocol frowns on this and it can be misinterpreted as opening a breeding ground for competition rather than incorporating the patrons' visibility to reach out to the community.

If I can take this one step further, immigration regulations further complicate being a patron in countries where residents live on short-term renewable residency permits rather than a guaranteed indefinite leave of stay, so what possibilities are there for these people to play an effective role of patronage?

There are large minority communities in all of our Arab world that go completely unrepresented and unmentioned in the state artistic and cultural agenda. In my opinion, this marginalisation is discouraging for both the patron and for any artistic cultural production that may address the existence of these minorities. I find it admirable that, in spite of no legislative action for patrons or patronage and no incentives, from this void come patrons, patronage, non-profit spaces, ambidextrous spaces, private collections, private museums, endless shows, regionally and internationally, and venues for production and display, art fairs and galleries.

I would like to brainstorm on what the terms patron and patronage mean to me from my own experiences. Two biennales ago, at the Sharjah Art Biennial, I was asked to give a talk alongside the artist Khalil Rabah, him being the artist and me being the patron. My understanding of being a patron has evolved since then and has taken on

another dimension. It has moved away from the simple one-dimension act of funding artists' projects or exhibitions, and expanded into this new multi-dimensional model on which I can work with artists, share experiences with them from other shows I've visited, do sneak peeks at their work, do a critique, listen to their thinking processes.

This understanding of patronage comes from experience. It is because my interaction with, and observation of, some of the most seasoned patrons like Salwa Mikdadi and Suha Shoman has created a space for me and defined frameworks to work within, without overlapping or being repetitive, ensuring that my work is both relevant and laying some groundwork to be built on by others later.

I grounded my own art initiative, MinRASY Projects, which was founded in 2009. MinRASY Projects rests in my head—that's its piece of real estate. We've done interventions, art in public spaces, commissioned art works like Tarek Atoui's sonic metaphor *Unplified*, and some art publications. I keep MinRASY Projects separate from other artists' initiatives. I invite artists and curators to collaborate on projects that I have conceived. In 2010 I started working on a museum project with curator Samer Younis, the Museum of Manufactured Response to Absence (MoMORta). MoMORta, above everything else and appropriately for CIMAM, is about museum authorities and narratives, but that's another twenty minutes of discussion, which we'll leave for another time. In order for us to create objects for this museum, we started commissioning objects. MoMORta is an ongoing project. We're frequently working on new commissions, and rethinking and changing submitted works for the collection. There are very specific guidelines and a time framework for the objects, and we do pay the artists a fee and the cost of production [of their works]. When we first started giving commissions there was much resistance from the artists regarding any input we wanted to include. It took time to gain the trust of the artists to work together rather than in isolation. Between displays, MoMORta is in storage. All four instances in which it has been displayed have been the contexts of interventions, not in art shows as such. By requesting commissions from artists, the MoMORta museum project becomes a patron of the arts, working in that depth and new dimension I discovered, which is building concepts from ideas, to tangible objects with artists, cultural managers, curators, exhibition designers, and so on. Patrons can be individuals or institutions. A successful patron should condition audiences for taste. They should be opinion-makers, guardians of the work now and prepare for its legal protection in the future. So patrons, in my opinion, should be more than just cash-injectors or underwriters of a project.

Patronage comes from different parts of the body: the mind, the heart, the eye. Patronage can only be from individuals, even within institutions. So it contains a human element; it's about humans working together, interacting, brain-picking, networking.

On my last MRI, my brain measured 1130 cm<sup>3</sup>. Ashkal Alwan, an incubator for artistic production, has a whopping 1000 m<sup>2</sup> of vastly open spaces, allowing for versatility and porousness in production. No artistic production can happen without interaction—whether it's with another human being, the environment, or the angels. No man is an island. Asking Christine Tohme, its director, about the impact of physical space on production, she says, 'It opens up infinite possibilities and allows for multiplier effects of benefits because larger numbers can be accommodated for'. The National Council for Culture, Art and Letters in Kuwait provides thirteen artists' studios free of charge, plus a modest sum for materials. The National Council assumes a more classic and traditional role as patron. In this case neither the patron nor the artist leads; art is produced within the confines of an accepted definition, which is how mainstream patrons assume their role outside of our networked art circle.

Gallery spaces are becoming ambidextrous and are easily transformed from selling spaces (right) to non-profit spaces (left). I haven't made up my mind on this practice yet. I do recognise that in the absence of legislators, of governing bodies such as boards of directors or boards of advisors that regulate the use of these spaces, the switch becomes easy because the community you serve is not represented in the decision. And not all patrons have the same listening skills. Are commercial gallery spaces and non-profit spaces patrons of the arts? Are commercial galleries using this ambidextrous skill to validate themselves as patrons? I think this can only be answered individually, based on their programming, library, community outreach and this new multidimensional patronage to the artists. Meem Gallery in Dubai holds a library, the Noor Library of Middle Eastern Art, that houses a collection of sixteen thousand publications relating to art and culture in our area. This is an extraordinary patronage from a commercial gallery that gets absolutely nothing in return. And if I may take this comment just one step further, the director of Meem Gallery lives in Dubai on a renewable residency, which means nothing guarantees even his leave of stay to safeguard either his gallery or the library.

Art fairs are limited in number in the Arab world. I will refer to the one with the highest visitor numbers and internationally the most recognised branded art fair of the Arab world: Art Dubai. Art Dubai is ambidextrous—free-to-attend programmes

known as the Global Art Forum (GAF) run parallel to the fair and commission works which, interestingly, will sometimes be only within metres of the fair selling the art works. From my experience, Art Dubai is a patron and its patronage is extensive and includes curatorial counselling. The fair's director Antonia Carver is actually from the left, having worked on non-profit cultural initiatives before taking up the role of fair director. Artists are selected and given grants to make work that is relevant not to the fair, but to the contemporary dialogue which often borders on material deemed sensitive but not sensational. In 2013 GAF provided a platform for redefining the term MENA, as in the MENA region, and re-coined it Middle East Nervous Anxiety. They certainly have a sense of humour! Art Dubai is a commercial fair first and foremost, but to me it is sending a clear message about the role of patronage in the art-world food chain.

Which leaves me with another type of patron in this vast cultural infrastructure that is being built in our area: auction houses. Yes, auction houses must be patrons; they function to elevate the status and visibility of artists. Or do they use artists to raise their own visibility, which is what sometimes motivates people to become patrons? This form of promotion of artists should not be confused with the promotion of their artistic production, because at auction houses it is artists' names are brands that stir interest, and not necessarily the art that they produce. Many successful artists at auctions are heavily promoted by auction houses. Some of the promotion tools are publications focused on the artists with documentation of the studios and studio practices, reaching as far as collaborations with museums to produce solo shows before unleashing these works on to the market. And when auction houses have leverage with museums, the benefit to artists is exponential. Indeed, auction houses play the role of taste-makers and patrons to the arts.

Are art collectors patrons? Tricky question. As a generally accepted concept, yes. To me though, it just doesn't cut the mustard to buy the image from the cover of Christies. To enjoy being referred to as a patron, I'm always looking for the other dimension: is there something the collector does tirelessly and benefits the collection, or extends beyond it and bears some kind of fruit? This would include commissioning work and donating works to institutions. Did this collector initiate a dialogue, or make a difference somehow, somewhere, to become a patron? Kamel Lazaar is a collector who, among other initiatives, via his foundation carries the platform for Ibraaz, a critical forum on visual culture for the Mena region. In an interview, when asked about Ibraaz, Lazaar said, 'I like to think of these initiatives as a series of small actions that have collateral benefits that

cross-pollinate one another over time'. It is Lazaar's patronage that was more visible to me than his collection, but it is his collection that spawned ideas and initiatives that validate it, not vice versa.

Hot on the heels of Qalandya International, the Palestinian Biennial that is being held now, is the Jerusalem Show. It's more than just a show — it's a biennale within a biennale. Interestingly enough, Jack Persekian, the curator of the show, did not create the sphere for his production for artistic practice; he did not develop the spaces or confines of his patronage to artistic production in Jerusalem. The local, political, social, economic and cultural context of being in Jerusalem created the sphere. On the subject of being situated in Jerusalem, Jack says, 'Politics is a fertile ground for artists to draw ideas and topics from. So in this framework, I think that politics is no constraint. On the contrary, it provides an abundance of issues and concerns to deal with, address, or at least, take a position on'.

Let's touch on museums. There are a number of contemporary museums in progress in the area. A museum is a highly sought position for patrons and collectors. A museum's patron is on the top of the patron's hierarchy pyramid. Museums are also highly aspirational venues for artists and curators. In this legislative void that exists in protocol formalities, will there be a role for the private patron in the museum? If I read regional and local protocol correctly, then I think museums have no chairs for private patrons. Private patrons in the context that we are discussing here, people who reside in countries but are not necessarily citizens, will often have spent most of their adult life as residents. Without private patrons on museum boards, who are usually the most instrumental stakeholders in museums, the horizon for relevant and artistic production and reception to initiate change or document narratives moves even further away, removing representation of minority communities, who may not exist as community members in the legal framework but who are certainly physically there, and the opportunity to open relevant engaging dialogue via patrons and patronage diminishes. Whenever I'm presented with a new proposal, I always look to see who are other prospective patrons. Who are the others who will lend their support and confidence? Before committing to a project, I bind its initiators to the notion that I expect accountability as much from the executors as I do from the other patrons.

These are my own thoughts on patrons, patronage and spheres for production and reception. Some of this discussion could be taken to other panels and still be relevant.

I would now like to talk about the legal registration of my own venture, MinRASY Projects. I am, to date, a lifelong, short-term,

subject-to-renewal resident of Kuwait, which means that every five years I will resubmit for a residency permit. I have registered MinRASY Projects in the UK because of the nature of its activity and because in the UK I can become the sole owner of the entity, therefore I can protect its interests under the law of that country and can open a bank account for this entity. But boy, is Uncle Sam watching over the activities I fund! I'm trying to pay my exhibition designers for a recent project in Ramallah. This is the content of an e-mail the bank sent to me: 'What connection does X have with 3 PLUS Design and Architecture? Why is USD being paid to an account in this individual's name? Are these likely to be transferred elsewhere? Which exhibition does the work relate to, and is there a little more detail on this? Is there a contract which describes the work which X has carried out? If so, can we see a copy? Apologies for this. However, our compliance department requests this information in order to comply with the regulatory expectations in relation to monitoring payments into high-risk jurisdictions. They should not have any questions beyond this.' They did. Are compliance departments and banks becoming inadvertently part of a patron's psyche when trying to fund projects? In a world filled with sensitivities over religion and politics, and in projects open for interpretation, what effect will this have on patrons? I think the monitoring of bank compliance departments may affect spheres of production in high-risk jurisdiction. Let's take this back to Jack for a minute — not only is he working under a physical occupation, but the financial constraints are equally challenging, and the movement of money into Palestine is not a guarantee. By the way, it's the US Treasury that defines high-risk jurisdiction.

In regions where rule of law is subjective, there is a high level of assumed risk for patrons. Patrons have to think very carefully not only of the material proposal but also of its sociocultural environment (I do this all the time). And what are the boundaries that they are willing to push? Or, how much of the project should be reigned in?

Before finishing, if you allow me to flip this coin of patrons and patronage over quickly, on the other side we find an idea that is widely debated in the Western world and has not yet surfaced in Arab art patronage, which is the acceptance or rejection of corporate patrons based on their company profiles, track records or principles. Admittedly, our regional corporations have not yet used the tools of marketing themselves aggressively through art. And, to be frank, I don't think that this will happen soon because of the previous issue I discussed, which is state visibility and profile versus art patrons and patronage. I would imagine that corporations would tread carefully here, because they don't want to

upset the balance of their relationships. I think there are indeed quite a number of alternative patrons and forms of patronage around us, bearing in mind that classic patronage plays no role in a bigger cultural state agenda. In fact, often these activities and spaces become the cultural events of the places identified with certain cities, such as Beirut, Dubai, Amman, Cairo or Jeddah. Certainly, this lack of legislation is promoting critical thinking outside of the state frameworks, but I question the sustainability of patrons, patronage and spheres for cultural production in the light of immigration laws, US banking regulations, social politics and protocol, and risk aversion. Thank you. [Applause]

---

Frances Morris: Thank you. That was brilliant, fascinating. I'm reminded that we have so many patrons in our presence, and it's really only with their support that we are hosted here for this event by His Highness the Emir Sheikh Tamim bin Hamad Al Thani, Her Excellency Sheikha Al Mayassa bint Hamad bin Khalifa Al-Thani. Of course, we are also supported at CIMAM by our founding patrons, and we are supported here at this event by Nimfa Bisbe and Ignacio Miró Borràs from "la Caixa" in Barcelona, and also by Marc and Josée Gensollen from Marseille. So, amongst you are many patrons and you will have the chance to hear one of Tate's great patrons, Luiz Augusto Teixeira de Freitas, who will be making the keynote speech on Tuesday morning.

But before we break for lunch, I think we have got just enough time to invite all of this morning's perspective speakers to come up on stage, to address any questions you might have. We will be gathering again after lunch for a longer moderated session, but I think it would be really nice to give people the opportunity, while those presentations are still fresh in their minds, to ask a few questions. So, can I invite you all to join me on stage?

---

## Questions and Answers

Frances Morris: When you do have your questions, since we are a community of colleagues and one of the wonderful benefits of meeting together is to get to know each other, I wondered whether, before you ask your question, you could say who you are. And just to say it nice and clearly, so we all know your background and perhaps can anticipate the position from which your question is coming.

I don't think we necessarily need to take an

order, because as I say, there will be a moderated discussion later on. So please do reach your hands up. We have a question from the front.

Bartomeu Mari: My name is Bartomeu Mari, Director of MACBA in Barcelona. I have a friend, Karel Schampers, who was Chief Curator at the Museum Boijmans in Rotterdam and then directed the Frans Hals Museum in Harlem, who used to say that art history is not written by art historians or by museum professionals but by collectors. And that was said twenty years ago and it seemed very provocative; today it doesn't seem so provocative, but I would like to ask you what you think the future role of professionals, specialists, museum curators will be.

Frances Morris: Is that a question to everybody, one by one?

Bartomeu Mari: To anyone who would like to answer.

Graham Beal: Well, I was actually interested in what Olav was saying, because, anecdotally I suppose, I'd always thought of the defeat of the critic happening around 1870, 1880, and being sidelined. Having been a curator of contemporary art for seventeen years, I always felt that we were very much behind the vanguard of the entrepreneur dealer and the private collector. I have a wonderful colleague who's from Spain, and when he describes his job as a curator in the United States it's very different from those of the people who stayed in Spain with whom he went to graduate school. And the same can be said for me as a director, when I compare my daily life with those of my colleagues in Europe. It's a very difficult thing; it's much more tied up with patronage, much more engaged at the social level of the higher echelons of society. The curators at the Detroit Institute of Arts privately would tell you quite quickly, most of them, that they're not very happy about the way we do business at the DIA; that we have essentially taken away a considerable amount of executive power, because some of my curatorial colleagues used to say 'My galleries, my collection'. Curators in museums similar to the DIA, at least in the States, are going to have to become much less like feudal chieftains running their own shows, and will have to learn rather than to instruct, to learn to negotiate with other people whose values are determining what is shown to the public.

Maria Lind: A crucial question is, then, how art history is going to be written, whether it is still primarily through the big institutions. It seems to me that a vast majority of large art museums today do programmes that can be described as canon-making, with the ambition of writing the new canon. But the canon being the principle model, it's only rarely to do with thinking about context, thinking about other parameters through which we can experience and discuss art. And one of the things

that is of concern, I think, is what happens to the kind of art that is not entering the art museums at all. At this point, many of the artists with whom I've worked for twenty years, as was mentioned by Olav, are not part of the commercial circuit at all—they're part of other circuits and, of course, they're brilliant artists, so how does that work survive and how is it written into history? I'm interested in thinking about models whereby this kind of work can actually survive within collections, or rather archives. And maybe that is not the archive of the art museum, maybe that is the archive of the city where the institution is located. And how can it be taken care of there? How can this kind of work be described, documented, debated, and so on? I think that could be a big question for the next generation of curators.

Frances Morris: So two answers and two deferrals—maybe that's deferred value—for later. Any more questions? I can see a hand.

Reema Fada: Hello, my name is Reema Fada. I write for Ibraaz and I'm also doing a Ph.D. on Cultural Politics in Palestine. I guess this is probably more for Rana. You spoke about the biases and restrictions that present flows of funding into Palestine, as well as the physical limitations facing practitioners and curators. But I wanted to know what you think about the role of civil society pushing back on these cultural restrictions, the cultural boycott in Palestine or, more generally, the cultural boycott in the arts field. Thank you.

Rana Sadik: What do you mean by cultural boycott? I didn't understand the question.

Reema Fada: Oh sorry, it was more about what do you think about civil society's role in pushing for a cultural boycott to readdress the restrictions and biases facing the region, in Palestine particularly?

Rana Sadik: I don't live in Palestine, so I can't really comment on that. I live in Kuwait. I don't think there should be a cultural boycott of Kuwait.

Reema Fada: No, no, not the cultural boycott of Kuwait, more what is the role of a cultural boycott within arts practices? It's not specific to a region, but more generally, as a form of civilian action to readdress these kind of political biases or restrictions on funding flows that you spoke of.

Rana Sadik: Okay, I still didn't understand the question, but in terms of restriction of funding there's really nothing you can do. Who are you going to boycott, the banks, the US Treasury?

Reema Fada: I mean that the boycott generally works in terms of putting pressure on the occupiers in the case of Palestine, so pressure is applied so that you can make these changes in terms of funding.

Rana Sadik: I understand. I don't live in Palestine, so I really can't answer that question. I'm sorry. Thank you.

Reema Fada: Okay.

Frances Morris: Any more questions? Fourth row from the back?

Varda Nisar: Hello. My name is Varda Nisar and I'm from Pakistan. My question is for Olav. Firstly, what were your criteria for selecting the countries you mentioned and your researching? Secondly, how does the validation of museums clash with what Hito was talking about in the morning? With free ports, and art being buried behind walls, how does that clash with her research? Thanks.

Olav Velthuis: On the selection of the countries I can give an honest answer, or a practical answer. The honest answer is for funding reasons; it's a project that is funded by the Dutch Research Organization and I guess that terms like these, which of course came from the financial world. The term BRIC Countries, as you probably know, was invented by Goldman Sachs. It's easier to get funding like that. That's the honest answer. Then there's an answer as to why I think it's a fair selection. They are probably the four countries that have the largest emerging art worlds. Perhaps they are not the largest, but among the five or six countries outside of Europe and the United States, these four are the most dynamic. At the same time, for me it's interesting as a researcher. There is a lot of diversity; there are different models. Brazil for instance — people in Brazil have been developing their art world according to a very different model to the one in China or in Russia. That's what makes this group of four particularly interesting for me. Then, coming to the other question about the free ports and the museums, again the free ports are there, and I won't deny they're an important development, but they're very much confined to a very specific group of collectors and a very specific group of artists. The type of art that is being stored there is not representative of what is going on in the art world in China, for instance. In the free ports you will find all the commercial artists who have been auctioned. They are completely conflated: auctioned artists will be in free ports, and all the other things that are happening in China — there are so many different circuits, Conceptual Art, Performance Art, and commercial art that is not being sold for these astronomic prices, that you will not find there. So this is just a fragment of what is circulating in the market, and even more so in the art world.

Olga Sviblova: Olga Sviblova, Multimedia Art Museum, Moscow. I would just like to pose a question regarding your method, how you study what's happened between the institutions and the market in these emerging countries. I saw your diagram of Russia, showing that the galleries had a higher influence than the institutions. You had five galleries for Russia, but I don't understand how you can study this. We have only just begun to have

private institutions. Institutions need money; so all directors everywhere do the same job in different ways. I'm just trying to understand your method, how you study, how you produce your statistics, because the case of my country seems to me a little different.

Olav Velthuis: No, you're absolutely right, I mean the picture for Russia is very different to, let's say, that of China or India. The involvement of institutions in Russia is much bigger and the market, as you just said, is very weak. What we do is we count galleries, institutions, based on monthly or bi-monthly gallery maps, so there will be many galleries included that don't have a high profile, that are just starting, that don't have a very active exhibition programme (there are definitely more than five in Russia). But you're absolutely right — the balance in Russia is very different to the balance in China or India.

Frances Morris: Sorry, could I just intervene? Maybe that's a discussion to continue over lunch, because obviously it's a complex one. Any more questions?

Rachel Dedman: Hi. My name is Rachel Dedman and I'm an independent curator working in the Middle East. My question is really for Rana. I was wondering what you thought about patronage from its other side, so to speak, because while your definition of patronage seems broad, and I think for many places is true, there's something to be said about Ashkal Alwan, which was one of your examples. You said that their big space in Beirut is an extraordinary opportunity for them to help artists and curators, and I totally agree, and you quoted Christine on this. But I wonder if there's something to be said about the way it was before, because, arguably, before Christine had such a space, she, and other curators and cultural practitioners who were coming up in Lebanon after 1990, at the end of the civil war, were doing very radical things in public space in Beirut, on the Corniche, interventions, working with artists. And of course, now that generation has matured it serves another function. I wonder if you could talk a little bit about what might be lost with that kind of patronage, because obviously patronage in many ways is positive, but perhaps there's something to be said about its institutionalising force, and maybe there's something lost in that process. What would you think?

Rana Sadik: I don't think there's anything lost in that process. I was giving the example of Ashkal Alwan in terms of patronage of space, making available that much space. In comparison, for example, I don't have any physical space, whereas the National Council has thirteen artists' studios. So there are different types of interaction, but from what I see from Ashkal Alwan affording that kind of space, and the amount of mentoring that is given to people who walk through those doors, and the

amount of open space that is available, I think that it's a successful process.

Rachel Dedman: I totally agree, I'm one of the people who have been mentored there!

Rana Sadik: Okay, okay! But I wonder whether actually having a physical place or a physical location changes your relationship to the environment in the city in which you operate. Maybe there's something, particularly in Beirut, where there was—and still is, in a way—a lack of infrastructural support and physical environment that has then prompted an energy in the city that is quite unusual. All these were really grass-roots entities and, particularly in the nineties, generated work that was unusual. Maybe, by the fact of having the space, something has been lost or changed.

Rana Sadik: I think that definitely something has changed, but I still think that both things are happening. I think there still is a grass-roots movement and I think having spaces is great. I think that there has to be (and there still isn't, although we're working very hard and very quickly towards this) is creating more complete infrastructures, having the full diagram. So I'm just talking about Ashkal Alwan as a patron in terms of the kind of space and mentoring that it offers, but that's as far as it goes.

Rachel Dedman: You need both. Thank you.

Frances Morris: So, I think we've got time for two more questions. There's one over here and then one in the front.

Luiz Augusto Teixeira de Freitas: My question is for Olav, and is based on a statement that he quoted in his presentation. You mentioned that the process of value creation these days is mostly the result of the influence of galleries and collectors. I think that there's an important issue that we have forgotten in this discussion, which is the role of the artist. A great part of this boom in the contemporary market would not exist, in my opinion, if artists could refrain from producing works following market demands. It's my own research and not scientific, but take the example of three or four artists who are really considered by critics and curators, who are each represented by four, five or six galleries, and each of these galleries take part in six, seven or eight fairs a year, they are also requested to produce works for two or three, sometimes four or five public exhibitions every year. If you multiply all these figures, you get a huge amount of works that are produced. So wouldn't it be reasonable to expect that the artist is also responsible for this boom, this craziness in the art world?

Olav Velthuis: Yes, I agree with that. The classical way of this validation is in terms of widening circles—an artist creates a work and first of all it circulates among other artists, and then the circle slowly widens to include critics, curators, and

then widens further to include collectors. What seems to be happening now is that the collectors are moving more towards the centre, they are coming into the process earlier than they used to be. Having said that, and this is in part a response to Bartomeu's question, it's very hard to generalise about these processes. The type of artists that you're talking about, the fair-producing artists, are definitely under pressure, but again, a gallery will always take a selection of artists to a fair, those who are more commercial, that people can appreciate and have an opinion about during the few seconds that art-fair visitors have to make judgements about works. Galleries usually leave out those artists who don't have that type of works, and luckily people don't receive the pressure of opinions generated at that kind of speed. Again, we can't generalise, not even for one gallery, and say that all the artists have the pressure of producing works for the demands of fairs. Let's leave it there.

Frances Morris: One final question.

Albert Groot: Albert Groot, from the Netherlands. Isn't public-funded art a form of education and indirect subsidy?

Frances Morris: Who'd like to answer that?

Maria Lind: If it's a subsidy, a subsidy to what?

Albert Groot: In the Netherlands, public institutions like museums are often funded by local governments, provincial governments or the state government, and one of their jobs is to promote education; they get money for that. But there are also institutions that educate artists who later come onto the market, but as they've been educated, wouldn't you consider that an indirect subsidy?

Maria Lind: In that case it would be a subsidy to the whole field of art, because everybody's working with artists and most of them have received an education, so yes, I would say so. Maybe what's more interesting, to me at least right now, is the kind of value creation which is not based on usual econometric values as I mentioned, but on other values. So if the commercial art system has something like Droit de Suite or resale royalties for auctions, where in certain contexts artists obtain a little money when their works are resold, what would happen if there was something like that in place in relation to smaller visual arts organisations doing the groundwork that large institutions and commercial galleries eventually benefit from? This would be the deferred value, and not only monetary value, that I was speaking of. What would happen if we had a slightly different system, or at least a different mentality in terms of crediting what has happened, the people who did the research twenty or thirty years ago on subjects that are being picked up and then bring in large visitor numbers, a lot of media attention, and occasionally also sales? What would happen if we could think about paying back to

the community, as it were, in terms of that kind of investment?

Frances Morris: I think that's an incredibly positive note on which to finish, because it's really the first question that we might think about this afternoon. Brains and muscles need food and that's next on the agenda, so thank you very much. And thank you to our speakers! [Applause]

---

Monday  
10 November  
2014

# Building Institutions in the African and Middle East Contexts

Gerd Nonneman: As-Salaam-Alaikum. Welcome to Georgetown University's wonderful auditorium. I'm Gerd Nonneman, I'm the Dean of Georgetown in Qatar and it gives me incredible pleasure to welcome your conference here, for this section of your proceedings. It's a special pleasure, because you're not only clearly part of a very important profession, but because at Georgetown we also have this interest in history and locality and so on, so we also work and will increasingly be working with organisations such as Mathaf and the Museum of Islamic Art. And of course, we work very closely with UCL, who are based in this very building on the third floor, to the extent that we have integrated our libraries as one, and it's a wonderful working relationship. So it's impressive to have a conference of this kind of calibre, of this international stature here. Not that Doha isn't used to having major international conferences, as you may know, but it's a particular pleasure to play our little part here as Georgetown in hosting you. Particularly since we have people here like the President of CIMAM, Professor Marí, who will be kicking off the proceedings in a minute, and also the Director General of ICOM. So that's all to the good. In just a few seconds, Dr Abdulla Al Thani, who is the President of Hamad Bin Khalifa University here at Qatar Foundation and with whom universities like UCL and Georgetown and the other branch campuses here have been working for several years now, who is our great defender, will be giving you his word of welcome. But I want you to know as well that Dr Abdulla is also someone who's got a very long-standing personal interest in the world of art and collecting, and so on. So with that and without further ado, over to Dr Abdulla. [Applause]

---

Dr Abdulla Al-Thani: Thank you very much, Gerd. Good morning to all of you. First of all, let me apologise on behalf of Her Excellency Sheikha Al Mayassa bint Hamad Khalifa Al-Thani, and Sheikh Hassan Mohammed Al-Thani for their not being here, but they are very supportive of your work and

they wanted to be here. Unfortunately, sometimes we have to deliver bad news, and late last night Sheikh Hassan lost his younger brother suddenly in London, and I think that's the reason why they are not here. So, sorry to start with such bad news but now let me make a few remarks and tell you a little about Education City.

President Bartomeu Marí, the President of CIMAM, the General Director of ICOM Anne-Catherine Robert-Hauglustaine, board members, ladies and gentlemen: it is my privilege to welcome you today to the conference at UCL Qatar. UCL Qatar is a three-way partnership between University College London, Qatar Museums and Qatar Foundation. It is one of eight partners of the Hamad Bin Khalifa University, our own emerging research university which is taking shape here at Education City. Education City, as you know, is the flagship project of Qatar Foundation, chaired by Her Highness Sheikha Moza bint Nasser. I think you will have all noticed at least two things in Qatar already. The first is that our country is developing very fast. The many construction sites, roadworks and traffic jams have given you a strong clue about this. The second is that our development goes far beyond economic and physical infrastructure. Yesterday you met at Mathaf, the Arab Museum of Modern Art, and some of you have also seen our stunning Museum of Islamic Art, and perhaps also the exterior of our new and spectacular National Museum. The achievements of Qatar Museums in culture and heritage under its chairperson Sheikha Al Mayassa bint Hamad bin Khalifa Al-Thani, are impressive. They go hand in hand with achievements in education and research. We are investing in education and research because we know that our future welfare lies in our evolution into a knowledge-based society. We have a particular interest in those branches of science that will affect our future, such as biomedicine, information technology, and disciplines around energy and resources. However, knowledge is not enough. We also need creativity, innovation and enterprise. Last week, the World Innovation Summit for Education, of which I am a chairman, convened at Doha to consider the importance of creativity in

education. Exposure to the arts encourages people to think differently and to experiment. This spirit is vital to a successful society. Qatar is probably changing as fast as many other societies in the world. Change is necessary, but it is important that people embrace change, not only tolerate it, because when we perceive change as a threat, it does not work. It is important to understand our culture, our past and our place in world history. It enables us to place change in the context of our lives and our identity. Qatar Museums is leading this important process through extensive public outreach. It is supported by Qatar Foundation, which, in addition to education and research, has a commitment to community development. For example, the new Qatar National Library located here at Education City.

UCL Qatar, our host today, is also supporting Qatar Museums through its learning and teaching, its research and its community outreach. It offers masters degree programmes in Conservation Studies, Museum and Gallery Practice, and Archaeology. UCL Qatar also provides training courses for mid-career professionals working within the culture heritage sector. The research conducted here is adding to our understanding of the Arab and Islamic worlds, with important projects in Qatar, and also in Sudan and Egypt. 'The Origins of Doha' project is excavating an area at the very heart of our capital, which is due for major reconstruction. A one-day public seminar was held in this building last week to present some of the findings. The relevance of this work is illustrated by the input of UCL Qatar to Msheireb, a new residential and commercial development which is growing up in a part of Doha where much of our history is concentrated. Archaeologists and architects have collaborated to design an attractive new quarter which incorporates traditional features of everyday life within a modern urban environment.

Ladies and gentlemen, Qatar is a country that has chosen education and research as a central pillar of national development. The pace of change is breathtaking and there is a real social need for both the inspiration of the creative arts and a deeper understanding of our past. I hope you are gaining an appreciation of a country which is excited about its future, and at the same time respectful of its history and heritage. I wish you a productive and enjoyable annual conference. Thank you for being here and thank you for listening. [Applause]

the Al-Thani family for the loss of the brother of Sheikh Hassan.

Thank you very much, good morning everyone. I would like to especially thank Georgetown University and University College London for hosting this second session of the 2014 CIMAM Conference. Thanks you Gerd Nonneman for the introduction. Today we have a session dedicated to a subject which is very much linked to the place, the region in which this conference takes place for the first time in its history. We have titled it 'Building Institutions in the African and Middle East Contexts'. Building institutions for art, education, preservation, heritage, research is something that more or less all of us, as professionals of the art world, have been concerned with. The context in which we are celebrating this conference now, along with Africa, are certainly building new institutions every day within realities which are very different to those we know in Europe and America. We are very interested in debating and learning from them, and this is why today we will try to construct a context that will be linked to the various professionals, projects and initiatives taking place in these realities. Yet, when we arrived here last Thursday, the executive team and I received an e-mail from Iftikhar Dadi, the person who is supposed to deliver the keynote speech today, saying that he was sick and could not travel to Doha. Discussing this event with Abdallah Karroum, our local board man and host of this conference, we decided we would give priority to keeping the subject of the first intervention and remain faithful to the title of the session, and transform this keynote speech into a conversation debate which will be moderated by Ute Meta Bauer. Ute Meta Bauer is currently Director of the Centre for Contemporary Art Singapore at Nanyang Technological University, and she has also been involved in the creation and development of different projects and initiatives in the fields of curating, research, education with and around contemporary art.

As you can read in your booklet, the sessions will follow with the presentation of the different perspectives. We also thought that we would give a little more time to these presentations, and instead of a Q&A at the end of the session we would have the debate and Q&A all together right after lunch. K. C. Kwok will introduce these presentations. Without further delay, I would like to introduce Ute Meta Bauer, and before that would also like to welcome among our audience today the senior academic staff and students of the University College of London who have also joined the conference. I'd like to say it's really wonderful to see such an audience from this perspective. I hope the contents and the debates of today really satisfy your expectations.

---

Bartomeu Mari: Good morning. Thank you, Dr Abdulla. First of all, in the name of CIMAM, I would like to offer condolences and sympathy to

In 2013 Ute Meta Bauer was appointed Founding Director of the Centre for Contemporary Art in Singapore at Nanyang Technological University. She has had a long career as an exhibition curator. I would mention her involvement in educational activities such as her job as Dean of the School of Fine Art at the Royal College of Art in London from 2012 to 2013. Prior to that, she was Professor at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in Cambridge, United States, where she was also founding director of the Program in Art, Culture and Technology between 2009 and 2012. From 1996 to 2006 she was Professor at the Academy of Fine Arts in Vienna, and from 2002 to 2005 she was Director of the Office for Contemporary Art Norway in Oslo. In 2002 she curated the Nordic Pavilion at the Venice Biennale, and is also well known for her co-curatorship and involvement with Okwui Enwezor's team at documenta 11, held that same year. As I said, these are just some of her many exhibitions and curatorial activities, besides which she has published many books and articles. Welcome Ute Meta Bauer. Thank you. [Applause]

---

Ute Meta Bauer: Yes, thank you very much. It's very unexpected for me to stand here, but that's life! First of all, I would also like to express my condolences and deep sympathy to the Al-Thani family. Life, as we said, is unpredictable. These things happen and we should continue in the spirit of this conference and make an effort to really engage in culture, which is very much linked to the Al-Thani family. This morning also Iftikhar Dadi couldn't be here. He's such an inspiring colleague and has such commitment to the region and to the topics that we wanted to discuss here. He is a dear colleague at Cornell University, and together with Salah Hassan has done tremendous work to address Africa and the region, including India and Asia at large. I think maybe we really should use this opportunity to open up, to talk about why we need these institutions, to discuss their differences with the institutions we already have in other parts of the world, their specificities and the different challenges that we face. So, having a little more time for debate might also be very good to share with our colleagues these very necessary debates.

Building institutions in the African and Middle Eastern contexts: we are already talking about two very different regions. What I think is very very necessary if we talk about expanding educational infrastructures and institutions of culture is to look too into the larger histories. CIMAM is dedicated to modern and contemporary [art], but there is no

modern and contemporary without their heritage, their deep histories and intrinsic links to our political and economical histories. I think this is really what is at stake and what we have to address.

Museums of modern and contemporary art were a fairly new wing of ICOM. At first, we had debates about why we needed these divisions, and then we were confronted with the very young history of museums of contemporary art, and more recently we were even discussing museums of the twenty-first century. And now we're going into regions where there are no museums, no educational infrastructure of the scope we are referring to, usually free access to education and to discussions of publics and public spheres. So we're talking about a very very diverse landscape, and I think that maybe the achievement of the last fifteen years is to have really become global forums of debates.

In turn, we have to discuss the role of the museum today. Yesterday we discussed publics a lot. Hito Steyerl talked about the secret museums and what we don't see in culture, what we don't see in art. Also the role of the art market: art is also big business, but on the other hand, art is also something very important for civic society. So how do we manoeuvre this complicated kind of overlapping of interests, mandates, etc.? Then comes the next story. Now, of course, there is a big attempt to catch up. I'm currently in Singapore, and next year for the first time the National Gallery will be dedicated to the modern art of Singapore and the South East Asian region, joining what the Singapore Art Museum began more than twenty years ago. So we're talking about young histories, but the question is, who defines those histories? Whose history is it? Whose art is it? And who can decide what the art of region is? What we discussed about the canon yesterday, is there one canon? Can we even speak of that? Is it not a very complicated history that contradicts itself? And as institutions, how can we communicate that to the public, to the next generations? What is also often forgotten today is this huge pressure of addressing a public, getting more people into museums, being more accessible. Another role of the museum is dealing with the preservation of current histories for the generations of tomorrow, allowing research and not just addressing the immediacy of contemporary histories.

Over the last two years there has also been some focus on places where museums are being shut down. The museum in Sarajevo was threatened with closure, because history was supposed to be rewritten by a new national history. How do we deal with this? What are the ethical codes? Yesterday a mention to moral panic was made. So I think these are all very very important topics that should be addressed by organisations like CIMAM: what are

ethical codes? What are the codes of collecting? What are the codes of selling art? This esteemed forum with these esteemed colleagues is perhaps the right setting for this to be discussed.

I would like to introduce our speakers this morning, and also thank the colleagues who will join this panel, this discussion, in a very improvised manner. First of all, I would like to introduce Salwa Mikdadi, associate professor of the practice of Art History at the New York University Abu Dhabi. She's a curator and art historian who has specialised in modern and contemporary art of the Arab world. Her research interests include gender and politics in art, art institutions and support systems of the arts. Prior to joining NYUAD she worked at Abu Dhabi Tourism & Culture Authority, where she established the first development programme for museum professionals. She was Executive Director of the Arts and Culture Program at the Emirates Foundation, Abu Dhabi. She is also co-editor of *New Vision: Arab Contemporary Art of the Twenty-First Century*, published by Thames & Hudson, among other publications. She wrote the reference guide on the history of the twentieth-century art in West Asia, North Africa and Egypt for The Metropolitan Museum of Art timeline web page. Mikdadi was also the founder of the Cultural and Visual Arts Resource in 1989, and its director until 2006. This was one of the first non-profit organisations dedicated to promoting Arab art in the United States. Last but not least, she curated the first Palestinian Collateral Event exhibition [*Voices from Palestine*] at the Venice Biennale 2009 that I had the pleasure to see and to experience.

The other panellists will be Gabi Ngcobo, who only arrived last night and was very surprised by the news that he had to join another session! She's an artist, an independent curator and educator based in Johannesburg. She has collaboratively and independently conceptualised projects in South Africa and around the globe. In 2011 she curated DON'T/PANIC, an exhibition that coincided with the 17th UN Global Summit on Climate Change in Durban. She is also the first POOL Curatorial Fellow and her exhibition *Some A Little Sooner, Some A Little Later* was held at the Zurich POOL Luma/Westbau space from June to September last year. As co-founder of the Center for Historical Reenactments (CHR) based in Johannesburg and co-operated on *Pass-ages: References and Footnotes* in Johannesburg. She also contributed to the two-year-long research project Xenoglossia that culminated in other projects: *After-after Tears* in New York, and *Xenoglossia*, the exhibition in Johannesburg, both in 2013. And her project working title *Create, Curate, Collect: A Portrait in Three Parts* was presented at the 2014 Joburg Art Fair as part of the event's Special Projects. Gabi is also a faculty member of The Wits School of Arts in

Johannesburg. What is very interesting to me, working with David Goldblatt and also Okwui Enwezor, who was the curator of the 2nd Johannesburg Biennale, is to look into how the histories and the settings, the infrastructures change very quickly, even over the course of a decade. I think it will be very interesting to hear an update also from you on the situation I experienced when the Johannesburg Biennale was shut down due to conflicts like the local versus the international, the interests of a local art ecosystem versus the global players who are often parachuted in. I think that's another thing we have to discuss, along with sustainable infrastructures.

And last but not least, our third panellist will be Abdellah Karroum, whom most of you know of course as our host. He's a curator and writer, but this morning we will not have him on the panel as the Director of Mathaf but as the founder and artistic director of a number of art initiatives, including L'appartement 22, an experimental space for exhibitions and artists' residencies founded in 2002 in Rabat, Morocco. He curated the éditions hors'champs series of art publications and in 2007 set up a radio station. Artistic director of *Inventing the World: The Artist as Citizen* for the biennale in Benin in 2012 and curator of *Sous nos yeux. Before Our Eyes* at La Kunsthalle of Mulhouse and MACBA in Barcelona. Associate curator with Okwui [Enwezor] at the third Paris Triennale of *Intense Proximity* held at the Palais de Tokyo. Other curatorial projects include *Sentences on the Banks and other Activities* at Darat al Funun in Amman, and a proposal for articulating works and places for a third biennale in Marrakesh. He has just curated Shirin Neshat's exhibition.

Again, why is this so crucial? I first experienced CIMAM fifteen years ago, when there were very few guests from other parts of the world other than Europe or north America, so it's remarkable how global our organisations are today. It's also remarkable to finally recognise the scholarship and the achievements that have been generated in the regions. Art is everywhere and so are scholars, and I think that we are finally catching up, and respecting and recognising that. With no further due, I invite my colleagues to the panel. [Applause]

---

Ute Meta Bauer: This was maybe a lengthy introduction but I think it's really crucial that we also consider who we are, what CIMAM is and what issues we address. As stated by President of CIMAM Bartomeu Marí, it's the first time that they are addressed in this part of the world, so we should

see what this really means. I think it's good to start with Salwa [Mikdadi], who has dedicated so much of her academic and curatorial life to the region and to [studying] where we are in terms of institution building. How do you see the perspective and how do you see the links between collecting, preservation and education?

Salwa Mikdadi: Thank you, and thank you for inviting me here. My condolences to Sheikh Hassan and his family.

This is a huge subject, very broad, so I'd like to focus on three areas this morning. One is the relationship between these young institutions and the government. Another is that of professional networks and the standards of professional practice in the region. Third is the relationship between these institutions and the universities. These are three essential areas that have been somewhat marginalised in relation to what's happening with the market and the emphasis placed on commerce and the arts in the region.

Years ago, the Association for Modern and Contemporary Art of the Arab World, Iran and Turkey (AMCA), held a session at the College Art Association entitled 'Art Without History', and as Ute mentioned, it's assumed by many that this art began now, or was discovered one day, and that the practice of art and art institutions in the region have no history. This is something very important to note because, much like Napoleon discovered Egypt kind of late, there also seems to have been a late discovery of the art of the region. The reason I say this is because earlier, in the past century, we lacked the infrastructures for these institutions to develop, and governments were not equally supportive in all Arab countries. When we discuss the Arab world [we should bear in mind that] this is a huge region, with almost 400,000,000 people, so we cannot generalise that all countries in the Arab world are similar. It's very important to note that each one has its specificities.

As I said earlier, I'd like to focus on the relationship between these institutions and the government. There are twenty-two Arab countries, and only eight of them have cultural policies, which is very important for the development of art institutions in the region. Why is this? First of all to safeguard the rights of artists, intellectuals and writers in the Arab world, and to ensure that there is proper legislation in place, to protect them and sustain their work over many generations. The first of the eight countries that have adopted cultural policies in the Arab world did so in the fifties and, to date, none of them have revised these policies. These laws were supposedly enacted between the fifties and the seventies, but were maybe not put into practice. If we read the cultural policy of Tunisia, for example, we'll be surprised to see how supportive it

is of artists' freedom. In reality, however, that's not the case, as we saw during the period prior to the Arab Spring.

We also discussed yesterday the role of the artist, and the role of the artist in the Arab world has changed. Actually, as the artist Shirin Neshat mentioned yesterday, she doesn't work in the studio, she works somewhere public, and that in itself has changed the role of the artist in this region too. Most of the members of our young generation of artists work among the public instead of in their studios. They carry their digital cameras and their computers everywhere, recording, actually recording history as it happens. And that has quite an impact on government legislation, because the public, the general public now in Egypt, in Tahrir Square, knows the artists, they have worked with them, painting on the ground and on the walls. This has changed the position of the artist dramatically over the last five years, from an art restricted to a few to an art for the public. This in itself supports artists' recent demands for new legislation in the field of arts and culture in Egypt, for instance. So, very briefly, this is one area.

Another is the fact that in order to have viable institutions we also need stronger networks among professional practice groups within the region, to communicate with important institutions or networks such as CIMAM and others. In my very first research on Arab art institutions in the early nineties, I interviewed twenty-nine Arab art institution directors and only one of the twenty-nine deemed it necessary to have a professional practice group of curators or art practitioners. This has changed now, and there is a critical need to set standards for the profession, ethics for curators who are working in between the commercial and the non-profit sector.

The third area, where I am now situated, is the university. We have few universities connected to museums in the region, and we need to strengthen these relationships between the research that be conducted at universities and how it can serve institutions such as museums. So basically, these three areas have been a concern of my research over the last twenty-five years, and I am delighted to be here today to discuss this with you.

Ute Meta Bauer: Salwa, before I move on, I would like to ask a question. How do you see the dilemma we face in different parts of the world? If we talk about the Arab world, it's very diverse, the constituencies are very diverse, so we still talk about the Museum of the Arab World versus national museums, which are equally problematic. The Museum of Modern Art is called a museum of modern art and has its location, New York — it's not like the museum of modern American art. How do you see this, with your long experience? Is it necessary to address the specificity of a region? How

would you cover it? What do you think is productive?

Salwa Mikdadi: I think we need to look at it two ways. Mathaf approached it in its name, which is the Arab Museum of Modern Art. It was very clear from the name that this museum was about art from everywhere, am I right Abdallah? We say that, but at the same time, as I mentioned yesterday, the vital role of museums here is to preserve and record the history of Arab art which [is something that] had not been done previously, or had been done in bits and pieces over the last one hundred years. So we don't have a central museum that has gathered information, or enough scholars who have worked on this subject and therefore are just beginning to gather primary documents published in Arabic in the twenties and thirties. Unfortunately, much of these sources have now been destroyed, for example in Syria, as we know. Libraries too... the National Library of Iraq was destroyed during the American invasion, not long ago actually, this century. That was a major resource for our research. We have very little time really to save what remains of the history of art and the history of culture in general in the Arab world, due to the continuous conflicts, wars and atrocities that are taking place and that are affecting our reservoir of culture. We need to record that as quickly as possible and gather this information. My colleague just handed me some books published in the nineteen sixties, which are very valuable. She had a few extra copies that she had found. So I was very excited (I haven't been so excited in a long time) to have a few brochures by artists from the sixties because, as I said, many have been destroyed.

Ute Meta Bauer: I'm handing the microphone over to Abdallah who has experienced both [situations]. Dealing with contemporary art, where there are no spaces for contemporary production if one does not invent them. They haven't come from the government but from the art community, to show each other what is to be done and to invite other artists. This doesn't follow any national agenda; it just follows the artistic production of a locale. Now you're basically the head of a museum with an agenda and maybe you can tell us a little about the impetus behind the setting up of L'appartement 22 and other initiatives of yours in Morocco, and what differences you find here, wearing a different cap.

Abdallah Karroum: Thank you. One remark before answering your question. Thank you for your introduction. It's important today that we are in a university. As Sheikh Abdulla says, the proximity between university and museum is very important. We need to define [what we mean by] institution. An institution does not necessarily precede action or the object. The organisational aspect of the institution or the display could come after the production; I think this is usually the case.

So now to speak of L'appartement 22, which is a very interesting project that dates back to the years 2001 or 2000. It's a project that started at the university, in a context where there was no established institution for art (for modern art, for contemporary art or simply for art), but there was a landscape, a number of artists and intellectuals who produced articles, thinking and art works. Sometimes they exhibited them outside the country, sometimes in small commercial galleries. But in Morocco, as in many African and North African countries, there were no spaces where artists were invited to produce—just investigate, research and produce art works that were only for thinking, for education. There were, of course, a lot of places that were predestined to house what we would call artistic activities, as something supposed to be part of the corpus of education. In general schools we have what we call art education, initiation to art for example, but we don't have places for research, places for exploring ideas, exploring the position of artists, exploring how we can create a space and artists can define their position, propose projects for society and become actors or citizens who contribute to thinking the future of society. As I said, L'appartement 22 was set up at a university because when I completed my studies in France, in Europe, I returned to Morocco, to Rabat, and there was a desire to work with artists of my generation. I was in my thirties at the time. I met a lot of artists who had very important proposals for society, social projects, artistic projects, philosophical projects. They were saying 'I am part of this society, I have a project and I want this society to look like this, so my art work, my thinking need to be taken into consideration by political thinkers or planners, or by people in the sphere of economy, by municipal authorities'. The context was nothing like that of Doha today; we didn't have the same resources, it was completely different. At that time the university did not have an art department. I wanted to set up a department for the arts at the University of Rabat, and in discussions with the president of the university at that time we realised that it would take twenty years to have a place where people could learn and where artists, or thinkers or curators could be 'produced', so to speak. So I decided to start this education programme in my apartment. This was the first programme that was set up in 2002 with a series of talks and workshops based on the idea of lessons (lessons in painting, lessons in film, lessons in writing), each with one teacher (one painter, one architect, etc.). Every field was approached from this perspective of sharing an idea that was explored, investigated, written about by one individual, a researcher, and inviting an audience to experience it, if it was a production, or to interrogate it and understand it. Then came a series

of residencies in my place which, after a few projects, became a public space — it was a private space that became a public through practice because the artists appropriated the place and audience started to come and listen or to meet the artists. This is how this small project started. It began as a post-research project at the university when we realised that we didn't have that kind of space, and all we wanted was a place from which to offer an artist a platform to share a project and we did not have this arts centre. As a curator, I was thinking about what we could do to bring artists and audiences together, so I found myself in this position. I don't know if it was the easiest, but for me now I think it was the fastest [project], it was the simplest of those I've done, although now I realise it was not that easy.

Ute Meta Bauer: But basically you assumed the agency, the responsibility, the initiative yourself. Another artist in Morocco was Yto Barrada, with the Cinémathèque Tanger. Nobody had dealt with cinematographic history and so, as in other cases, artists or young curators just did it themselves. When institutions just don't exist, as in Morocco, where there was no such museum, how can these practices be linked to this notion of research, and of making them accessible later to a wider public or for future research? How did this bridge appear? And, as Salwa mentioned, these practices are there, so how can they be dealt with by institutions without being swallowed by them or 'owned', and considered instead as a very productive way of constituting those institutions?

Abdellah Karroum: I think, to be brief, it always starts with a need. The material is there, whether it's archive, it's history, it's knowledge in general, and for an institution to be accomplished it would need to add the tools. So we have the material and we have the tools, either to create and edit a publication, or to create a physical space, temporary or permanent, to respond to the needs. In the example of Yto Barrada and the Cinémathèque, she had an interest in film-making, in images in general, to tell her own history and her country's history. The need was produced by the lack of investment by the state in modern and contemporary cultural production, whereas in many countries around the world the investment isn't necessarily in listening to artists, in creating platforms. Education would be about unification, or about propagandistic aspects, not development.

I think the context here is different, because the museums are amid universities and look to the future. It's completely different. So we have temporary spaces, made to respond to specific projects, as in the case of L'appartement 22, and spaces like the Cinémathèque de Tanger, which is more permanent because it is an archive and

therefore receives visitors who need to stay longer — it's a physical space. The rent of the Cinémathèque is about 10,000 dirham a month, because it's a big place that opened three years after the Apartment [L'appartement 22], whereas my place costs 200 euros to rent. L'appartement is based on temporary projects and the Cinémathèque is based on a long-term project because it has this archive.

Another difference we can establish is between very localised projects that respond to their context, and nomadic projects. Among the former, Apartment 22 stands opposite the Moroccan Parliament, so it's a political statement as well, a position in which we face the seat of power from the space of another power — that of art — that creates this very localised dialogue. The latter, nomadic projects, respond to very different problematics, both in the spatial terms of a specific geography, and in the idea of moving in political or social terms, moving between the sphere of education, art and politics. So they really comprise many many categories.

Ute Meta Bauer: So what you propose is essentially the idea that the museum is not alone; often it doesn't exist, but if it exists it must admit that it's not alone, that there's an ecosystem around it. Very often, in the past, museums were a little ignorant of their ecosystems, and I think that that is something that luckily has changed, and has to continue to change. With Gabi, I would say that I experienced a generation... I just mentioned David Goldblatt, an artist I met early on, when working at documenta, who could be described perhaps as the kind of artist who was a witness of history. David would not do works outside of South Africa; he said, 'This is my place, this is where my agency is, this is where I see myself. I can show it elsewhere but I can't produce elsewhere'. He was also very involved in supporting a younger generation in their education (in terms of lack of access to proper education), supporting a next generation of artists. But you [Gabi Ngcobo], I would say, are more an artist as researcher, an artist as curator, and you assume that agency much more in terms of who writes the history and who disseminates the history, in order to keep control of that. Maybe you could tell us a little more, because I think it's very interesting in your curatorial practice, which I see developing into an artistic practice.

Gabi Ngcobo: Thank you and good morning. And thanks for inviting me to this panel, which is an extra so I must try not to discuss my forthcoming presentation. If I repeat myself, forgive me.

I don't know where to start! Perhaps I could start by thinking about a symposium that was organised in Dakar two years ago by Raw Material [Company], which was titled 'Condition Report.

Symposium on Building Art Institutions in Africa'. It was in fact the recognition and mapping of a new movement in institution building in Africa, and elsewhere, but also of movements that are independent of colonial history and museums that were constructed during colonialism. It was really useful and interesting to be in that space, because you began to feel less alone having peers who were perhaps thinking about the same things and trying to develop a language to talk about history. When you were introducing me you mentioned the Johannesburg Biennale. For me it's a very fascinating phantom, a phantom pain because I missed it as well—I remember taking a bus from Durban to go and see the biennale but it had closed prematurely. So it turned into a fascination for something I didn't experience but which comes back to haunt me quite often, as an institution that is no longer there. And it's been interesting in terms of how, at the Center for Historical Re-enactments we've tried to reimagine, or to deal with the questions of local and global you mentioned earlier (and I will talk of this in my presentation). And so with the 'Condition Report' we also started to see the difference between what independence meant in Lagos and what it will mean in Johannesburg or in Harare, for example. Because in South Africa there are also historical institutions, such as the Johannesburg Art Gallery, that have been there since 1910, but at the same time there are some very new institutions set up after 1994, which are really considering making a franchise of memory, of history. And yet, for example, when Bisi Silva [Nigerian contemporary art curator] in Lagos is thinking of independence, it is a different kind of independence. Also, having had experiences and working in Kampala recently, one starts to think that the independence is perhaps not even independence. It's complicated by colonial residues that are still very much at play.

With regards to other new institutions in Johannesburg, you mentioned for example David Goldblatt and the Market Photo Workshop, which is a school that really focuses on teaching and expanding photographic language and is very accessible to young, black, would-be photographers. It has produced photographers like Zanele Muholi, Thabiso Sekgala, Sabelo Mlangeni, Lolo Veleko and many many others. And perhaps it does complicate or entrench the idea of photography as an entity in its own right, and that of art as an entity in its own right. Sometimes it really divides artists locally, because the Market Photo Workshop is about photography and sometimes it's hard to become involved. I've been asked to teach there, but it produces almost a shot, it's hard for us to sustain a discussion. But above all, what the symposium on building art institutions, the 'Condition Report' has

afforded me was a resource, a teaching resource that has been really helpful. At university this year I taught a course made up of thirty students titled Building Institutions as a Creative Act which was really trying to open up the possibilities of self-organisation in students, because often there are no opportunities for them when they complete their degrees. It was also designed to open up a space in which they themselves would be able to think about really pursuing their own initiatives when they leave the school. So it's all over the place, it's complicated and it's still trying to find a language. But I think that the platform in Dakar was really quite useful even to reject certain things, to see the trends, to be able to see where things are going and to retract from that, to keep them going.

Ute Meta Bauer: Speaking of Africa and of institutions, if you take for example Salah Hassan an Ibrahim Hariri, in terms of Sudan they wouldn't even be able to develop an institution concerning the art history of their own country in that country due to political reasons, and I think that globally it's not the only case. So the question is, even, how to protect the histories, and the histories of art? What you think are histories of art are not based on artefacts, they are based on sociopolitical relations, such as the role of artists, on whether artists are rejected or accepted in society, and which artists we are talking about, and how a can museum encompass and communicate that.

Before we open the session up to the public, could we discuss this? Marcia Tucker at one point developed in New York The New Museum, because she thought that museums had to change, they had to admit that artistic practices had changed and there couldn't be one canon. How do you see your experience actually shaping a museum that has to be different, in a nutshell?

Salwa Mikdadi: You spoke earlier about the ecosystem. My observation of the Arab world is that we have no systems, so that's why I mentioned legislation, networks and universities as helping to establish at least some of the support systems for art in the region. But to answer your question directly, it seems that the most successful art projects are those that are led by artists, [those that are] driven by the art itself rather than by an institutionalised project. They also reach a wider and more diverse population because they move between different regions, and they are more or less in a liminal space and yet are approachable—young people feel more comfortable in informal spaces than in formal museum settings. That is at least what I have observed. For example, a centre called Makan that was set up by an art professional in Jordan draws a large number of young people, and the topics or themes change. Different artists, writers or film-makers are all engaged in these discussions, at

which they decide to collaborate on specific projects. So it is continuously moving and changing, adapting and responding to the needs of the communities, although they focus more on Jordan and not just urban settings—this is one of the few organisations that I found in that they're moving outside of cities. So quite a few of these projects seem to be flourishing in the region, and there are a huge number of them, over a hundred according to a brief calculation I made two years ago. I think this is what we need to look at: how museums can learn from these smaller initiatives, whether they are formal or informal institutions. We're reaching a point at which those institutions or projects that were set up by individuals, such as Apartment 22 for example: what will happen to that project twenty-five years from now? How do you sustain a successful project like that? Well, it needs to be institutionalised, have board members, etc. So how would that comply with government regulations, with the status of non-profit organisations in the country? This is one of the major issues that we face in the Arab world, how to register non-profit organisations.

Abdellah Karroum: Thank you Salwa. I think that it's a very interesting problematic, the issue of institutional legislation. Talking about systems, you were saying we don't have a system in the Arab world. But I don't think a system is productive, a system understood as something institutionalised. However, in contrast, I think that methodology can be productive, methodology as opposed to systems—this can work. I'm now talking from [the perspective of] that space, not as director of a museum in Doha. A project like Apartment 22 as an example—there are many other examples in history, if you look at Africa for instance. I like the title of Building Institutions as a Creative Act, and Gabi's intervention about post-colonial activities or I would say post-independence, because sometimes independence can be more problematic than colonial periods. Post-independence implies having to move forward, dealing with what is left, the remains, which are very important. At this assembly in Dakar two years ago, Raw Material, we tried to make an inventory of creative spaces in Africa. I think we have many similar problematics in this region of the world, in the Middle East, and in other Asian countries such as Azerbaijan, Pakistan or Bangladesh; similarities in terms of methodology, how, from our observation as curators of artistic production, of discussion, of thinking about your society, we can formulate a challenge. Not how to help an artist to produce, not how to promote your friends, or position artists from your country on the global art market—it's not about that, but more about thinking of how to formulate a project for your own society, how to make the voice of artists heard, along with those of curators and other intellectuals

as citizens, as contributors, as part of this society, either with or against [the voice of] social organisations, government institutions. This is where the value lies, not in having the biggest building, for instance. We'll talk later about this methodology, but even big, official institutions can have this methodology, so it's not a question of the big institution as opposed to smaller ones, it's not official as opposed to independent. I think this is a very important issue. And just one remark about Apartment 22 and its sustainability, now that it has been functioning for twelve years and yet has never been officially registered: it does not appear in commercial registers, in those of associations or organisations, so it does not have any official existence on, paper. I hope this is not recorded and told to the police! [Laughter]

Gabi Ngcobo: My response to the 'Condition Report', when the conference was over and I was asked to write an essay for the publication, was to suggest that at least with CHR an end was involved, and my contribution was titled 'End Notes'. At that point I was thinking of it more as a performance, a performative act. It made me think that perhaps—and I'm speaking in the context of South Africa, where there are new museums, post-1994, with permanent exhibitions that cannot be moved or changed. This is the case of the Apartheid Museum, the Hector Pieterse Museum. The museums and the displays are created by architects, so as a curator looking after these exhibitions you're basically just looking after a display that is not supposed to be moved. So this proposal to end CHR for example was within that landscape, the idea that one could perhaps conceive of a museum with an expiry date that would exist alongside this permanence of history. There are many hierarchies in archives, although they are chiefly shaped by one voice, the ruling party, and it's really hard to find or to situate the blind spots. I think for CHR we were really interested in the blind spots in a place like Johannesburg that is changing really really quickly.

Ute Meta Bauer: We have ten minutes for Q&A: blind spots, the one voice in the museum. I'm sure there will be some resonance to these ideas. Are there any questions, comments?

---

## Questions and Answers

Q: Which were the countries that implemented cultural policies in the fifties?

Salwa Mikdadi: I said the first one in the

fifties was Egypt, followed by Tunisia, and I mentioned later that they developed further in the sixties and seventies, so the rest came later.

Q: Which are the rest?

Salwa Mikdadi: I can't remember them all quickly, but I can give you a list of them afterwards, I can write them down. But definitely Egypt, Syria, Iraq, Lebanon, Tunisia, Morocco. The Gulf countries have not followed through, but there is a book with a list of them, publications on cultural policy, although they're very old, as I said, and they haven't been updated. There is a publication coming out in English on the topic.

Q: Thank you.

Antonia Alampi: I'm Antonia Alampi and I'm an Italian curator at Beirut in Cairo, which has no actual connection with Lebanon! I would like to return to the matter of legal registration, questions concerning legality, economy and infrastructure really, that very much influence and shape the way institutions manage to sustain themselves in the region. I feel I have an urge to specify also certain things. It's the second time I hear Tahrir Square mentioned during the conference, as if nobody had noticed that Tahrir no longer exists — a *coup d'état* took place in Egypt more than a year ago, there is a new protest law, according to which protesting is impossible, people are in jail. There are two new laws that are actually going to threaten the life of organisations, including cultural organisations, in Egypt, and all of us are going to be threatened with possible lifelong sentences, and most of them relate to our legal registration and funding. I wonder as well, when we talk about collaborations between museums and with smaller institutions, how can the reverse process take place so that the partnership can inform the practice of larger museums in the future, etc.? How can larger institutions actually be supportive of smaller institutions whose lives are threatened and have a really hard time in finding even a way of surviving and sustaining themselves? Especially when we think of funding strategies, all the foreign funding that comes particularly from Europe and the United States, that tries to shape the form of our institutions and make them like how institutions would be run in Europe and in the West, which is in fact totally impossible to apply locally because of completely different legal systems, economic systems, infrastructural systems, governance systems, etc. Maybe this is more an emotional statement than an actual clear list of questions, but I wonder how we could actually try to be more specific, especially considering the diversity of the situation in this specific region, and explain how new collaborations can be approached in which we could talk of advocacy, for example? We need legal support, we need legal help, we need help in rethinking how funding is actually enacted.

That's it, I think. Thank you.

Abdellah Karroum: This is a very important and interesting question — legality. Sometimes it's very problematic. Initiatives or collaborations can even become criminalised in certain countries now; I think this is the tendency in some protectionist systems. But I think this is really a debate that deserves another conference in itself!

Salwa Mikdadi: Briefly, the reason I mentioned cultural policy is because it's defunct, as I said. It was from the fifties. Clearly, what was meant was to draw attention to the fact that during the Arab Spring, writers, film-makers and artists were advocating for a revision of this policy and nothing happened. And now, I agree with you that life is threatened and many are already in jail, as we speak. So there is no cultural policy supporting the work of artists or institutions in the Arab world that we can say is functional at this time, that we have freedom of speech or any of those legal systems found in other countries. So as I said, these smaller institutions are working in these interstitial spaces and are able to pop up among communities and seem to be the most successful at this stage, more than the main museums. At the same time, museums such as Mathaf are aware of this and are inviting these younger and smaller institutions to their spaces, to speak out. So they're giving them a platform (at least I hope this is the case), so at least they would get support until the policies change.

Antonia Alampi: In part, this is the issue I find at times, because the matter is not necessarily trying to find platforms to speak elsewhere but rather how we can actually get support locally. It's almost in the sense of say how many artists are actually sent to Cairo, do new productions and then are shown in museums all over the world. But there is rarely an interest in having their work actually shown in Cairo, because of course the infrastructure is weak, etc. It's much easier to send money for productions, for works greatly inspired by the local context, but there is no actual deeper interest in these works being visible and legible locally. The same can be said for the life of institutions: the problem is the life of institutions locally, that need to sustain themselves locally, because that's where the work is actually important and relevant, more than in, say, speaking or representing what we're doing locally elsewhere. Of course, platforms are interesting, but it's as if a different route were extremely needed right now.

Ute Meta Bauer: I think this necessity of space for local production and writing local history has been brought up by all of the speakers. I see there is a deep commitment and I think that is slightly different to museums in other parts of the world, where — and I think our colleagues can confirm this — there are also pressures. The Tate Modern has to expand because they have so many

tourists coming in, more than five million visitors that they can't stay in one building... Yes, like MoMA. I'm sure there are others, the pressures of tourism, of boards, etc., which are of a different kind, but what I see here is that you all seem very committed to your locale, to freedom of speech, artistic production, and actually negotiate with civic society through the arts, and I think that's something very important. Maybe before we close the session, are there any more questions?

Q: I just wanted to make a comment in addition. Actually, Abdellah gave an answer with this model of L'appartement 22. But you speak about the production of this grass-roots effect that will benefit local contexts, and not about the reproduction of the art system. The size of the institution doesn't really matter; what is important is what's left. That's probably the answer, the grass-roots effect—rather than speaking of post-colonialism, maybe we should be speaking of self-colonialism. I shared this debate on the bus with a colleague. This could be another way of seeing it, to indulge the view of a larger institution, the market, the artists you support locally.

Ute Meta Bauer: Luckily, two of the speakers will be making their presentations later and so there will be another Q&A session; I hope Salwa can also join that. And I think you now all deserve a coffee break and we will continue this very interesting debate after the break. Thank you. Thanks to the speakers, of course. [Applause]

---

Kian Chow Kwok: The session now will last one hour and a half, then we will have a lunch break of the same duration, followed by a panel another hour and a half discussion. We'll have to work very hard before and after lunch.

My name is K. C. Kwok. I'm on the board of CIMAM. I'm from Singapore but I have no affiliation with the private 'secret' museum. We've had presentations this morning already, which have already included two of the four presenters at the current session, Abdellah [Karroum] and Gabi [Ngcobo]. We will now have them again, now focusing more on their own institutions, as the topic today is institutions and the institutionalisation in the regions of Africa and the Middle East. We will also have Suha [Shoman] and Zeina [Arida], whom I shall be introducing shortly, and for the panel discussion this afternoon... in fact Gabi was just asking me whether she had to do three presentations today. Well, yes and no, because we can't have too many people on stage, as you see, there is a limited number of chairs. So we will continue to have Abdellah and Gabi, as well as Salah and Ute in front, close enough, which means that the audience may also ask them questions and provide comments

specific to their presentations. So in addition, then, to Suha and Zeina, who will join the afternoon panel session, we will have two other people: Mayssa Fattouh, who is curator of the Qatar Art Centre here in Doha, and Antonia Alampi, from the Beirut art centre in Cairo. So that will be this afternoon's panel. By doing this we also realised that all the issues that we've been discussing are all very closely linked, so it's not a question of working out mathematically how many presenters and so on, but of all of us here in this room sharing the issues and challenges together.

Speaking to some of the participants here, my attention was drawn to the brief for this session, the last paragraph of which says (this is, of course, talking about Africa and the Middle East) 'What is the role of art in the construction of a specific historical narrative within this globalised environment dominated by economic and political hierarchies?'. Now in the morning session we were reminded by Abdellah that instead of talking about a kind of post-colonial situation we should also place emphasis on a post-independence context, and indeed the idea of building institutions is very much linked to the idea—or rather the processes—of nationalism. Therefore the characteristics of institutions are likely to be more closely linked to a post-independence context than to post-colonial discourse. However, we were again reminded by a member of the audience this morning that it could be a problem of self-colonisation, for as long as the reference to the earlier colonial model of museum is valid, perhaps the museum process is in itself a kind of self-colonisation. The second and very last sentence in the text I mentioned asks, 'How is history written from directories that are dominated by religious, military and gender conflicts while also being submitted to censorship?'. Now there is some concern that this line refers particularly to the region that we are talking about today. I think we all realise that in fact this affects all of us, whether it is Africa, America, Spain, or Singapore for that matter—practically all places in the world face such challenges and such pressures. This is why we are all here today, coming from great distances from around the world in order to share these problems.

So CIMAM, as you know, travels all around the world to hold these meetings, which are not about a group internationally having professional knowledge that they just want to share with local practitioners, artists, etc., but rather about learning from each place, hence the focus on this specific region.

This links up nicely with the discussions yesterday, when we were wondering how we could possibly collect all the art works in the world when many of these works are not collectible, many of these works are not material-based. Yet there was

also a concern that the museum must assume the authority of defining what art is, because the museum has that role, and this is also linked to this morning's discussion about professionalism. If CIMAM, or a forum like this, does not provide a kind of notion of professionalism, then it cannot be a reference that would be helpful in local contexts regarding how institutions may be built. So there's a nice balance there between needing to learn from the regions, and collectively determining from our regions what is meant by professionalism in museums. But even as we talked about all this, we were very concerned yesterday that museums themselves are under siege by various forms of

artistic instrumentalisation, which again connects back to our last discussion of this morning about whether creating an institution in a context of post-independence is in itself some sort of process of political instrumentalisation. This is something that we might want to explore further and share in our discussion today.

The sequence of our presentation this morning will be Gabi, Suha and Zeina, and then Abdellah again. I will not introduce Gabi and Abdellah further, because Ute made an extensive introduction earlier on. So we will start with Gabi, and when Suha and Zeina arrive, we shall introduce them. Thank you very much. [Applause]

# Perspective 1

## Gabi Ngcobo

*Biography:* Gabi Ngcobo is an artist, independent curator and educator based in Johannesburg. Ngcobo has collaboratively and independently conceptualised projects in South Africa and internationally. In 2011 she curated *DON'T/PANIC*, an exhibition that coincided with the 17th United Nations Global Summit on Climate Change (COP17) in Durban. She is the first POOL Curatorial Fellow, and her exhibition some a little sooner, some a little later was held at the Zurich POOL/LUMA Westbau space from June-September 2013. As co-founder of the Center for Historical Reenactments (CHR), a project based in Johannesburg, Ngcobo curated *PASS-AGES: references & footnotes* at the old Pass Office in Johannesburg and contributed to the two-year research project titled *Xenoglossia*, culminating in the shows *After-after Tears* in New York and *Xenoglossia, the exhibition* in Johannesburg, 2013. Her project *Working Title: Create, Curate, Collect. A Portrait in Three Parts* was presented at the 2014 Joburg Art Fair as part of ARTLOGIC's Special Projects. Ngcobo is faculty member at The Wits School of Arts, Fine Arts Division in Johannesburg.

I'll just let you read the outline of my presentation so I don't have to read it out to you. The language is Zulu, which is my first language.

Slide. Akukho Ndlovu Yasindwa Umboko Wayo  
Translation: An elephant's trunk can never be

heavy for the elephant

Meaning: Your problems can never be bigger than you

Part 1: White Elephants

Part 2: Pink Elephants

Part 3: An Elephant in the Room

Part 4: When eating an elephant take one

bite at a time

Slide. White Elephants

noun. 1. a possession unwanted by the owner but difficult to dispose of.

*Our Victorian bric-a-brac and furniture were white elephants.*

2. a possession entailing great expense out of proportion to its usefulness or value to the owner.

*When he bought the mansion he didn't know it was going to be such a white elephant.*

Slide. Because I live [in] and think from Johannesburg, my presentation will begin with an example, or examples, of building institutions in this locale. It makes sense then to start with the Johannesburg Art Gallery as an example and useful catalyst for reading histories of institutions. The Johannesburg Art Gallery, or JAG as we call it, is located in Joubert Park, in the central business district where it has stood since 1910.

Slide. This is one of the displays that have been at the JAG for two years, explaining the founding of the institution.

Slide. And this was an exhibition that took place in 1988, *The Neglected Tradition*, curated by

Steven Sack, recognising that there are many, many, many other voices that were overlooked by this institution but also many other institutions in Africa, in South Africa during Apartheid.

Slide. These are archival images. I'm not sure what year they were taken. On the right is the very earliest image of Joubert Park where the JAG is situated, and there you kind of see it with the city just emerging in the background.

Slide. In the first slide, the entrance is facing a railway line, and this is a new entrance to the JAG. Basically there are two entrances, but this one has existed since 1986.

So, I'd like to quote from *Art South Africa* general article from 2004. 2004 as a year will feature in my presentation, and for me and many South Africans, 2004 is a marker of our ten years of democracy. The article, titled 'Back on the Map' and written by Alex Dodd, highlights where the JAG finds itself in the changing city — down the line, smack-bang in the middle of a thumping African metropolis. Some argued that this once bourgeois art institution no longer had a place in the thick of the high-density black urban neighbourhood like Joubert Park where, and I quote Dodd, 'both art and art lovers were at risk'. 'The truth is', writes Dodd, 'it probably didn't belong in its previous form'. Compared to others, Cape Town in particular, Johannesburg as a city has had to deal with real social and urban agencies that can be read, as this article underlines, in how the JAG was reinventing itself then (in 2004) by engaging with the sociopolitical conditions of being in Johannesburg, South Africa, Africa. I stress then, because ten years on I do not think that JAG is still on this journey of self-invention. It seems to be fixed in its crisis and entrenched in its image as a central white elephant in the city. So when assessing the impact of an institution such as JAG, it is important to note that JAG has no impact on its surroundings — it is its surroundings and the changing pace of the urban environment that should have an impact on JAG. And this is a historical fact, and not one necessarily ascribed to the post-1994 period.

Since 1986, with a new edition to the original structure, the entrance has changed at least five times. The JAG therefore has two possible fronts and two possible backs at any given period, according to the demands and realities of the surrounding environment. Also the conditions of the building, which is old and crumbling, due to lack of resources dedicated to its restoration.

Slide. This is an image of the new front of JAG, facing Joubert Park as it is now. This was taken this September.

Slide. I just wanted to show how artists have also been responding to the changing environment of Johannesburg. This is on Joubert Park, which

surrounds the Johannesburg Art Gallery, by Jo Radcliffe, a South African photographer.

Slide. This is also one of the strategies employed by JAG to invite the people in the park inside its walls.

Slide. Pink elephants

A 'pink' elephant is something that people are said to see quite often when they're drunk. It's a drunken hallucination.

Slide. For two years, the Center for Historical Re-enactments (CHR), a project that I co-founded in 2010, operated in a building located in Doornfontein, in the east part of Johannesburg, on the third floor of this building called August House. Not wanting to be caught up in discourses removed from our own questions, or questions we needed to develop ourselves at a manageable pace, we decided that rather than focusing on the walls, the floor and the ceiling, we would focus on the window of the space we occupied, as this would afford us the proximity we were seeking to reflect on our present, as it had been shaped by our history.

Among many things and realities we witnessed through the window was the pink elephant you see in this picture, which stands on top of a deserted and illegally squatted building that used to be a liquor store. This pink elephant increasingly became a symbol of how we felt about the construction of memory in so-called post-Apartheid South Africa. Re-entering history for us became an endeavour that enabled us to pursue the past with the blindness or even drunkenness that seems virtually impossible to achieve. It is this blindness through which a newly considered economy of commemorating may surface, one that is stripped of accountability, of ideas of nation-building, and one open to moments of surprise that are neither depressive nor awkwardly hopeful. Revisiting history in search of meaning in the present is the pursuit of something that can't even see itself in the mirror, of answers that have no questions, or at least not yet. In 2014, again, art historian and writer Ashraf Jamal posed the following question, 'How, then, to commemorate? Where does one begin?', and went on to suggest that perhaps at best by accident, or perhaps by enacting commemoration as an accident. For us, this pink elephant on Kerk and Nugget streets is exactly that: an accidental image that has allowed us to pursue a different language of memory-making and commemoration, counter to the many that we witness in the active franchising of memory at play in South Africa and its museums constructed after 1994 — the Apartheid Museum, the Hector Pieterse Museum, Freedom Park, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan Museum, etc. We won't name them all but there are many.

In an essay titled 'Bureaucratization of Memory' featured in the catalogue of the exhibition

*The Rise and Fall of Apartheid. Photography and the Bureaucracy of Everyday Life*, South African curator and writer Khwezi Gule notes, 'Maybe museums or memorial sites of the future need to be a lot less driven by curators and more by a participatory approach to the varied interpretations of the past. Implied in this position is the issue of how sites of memory can become more dynamic and evolving spaces that can account for different, inconvenient, and discomfiting counter-narratives, the mutability of memory, present-day contestations over power and privilege, the means to life, as well as symbolic representations, instead of acting as monoliths to ideology and the prevailing social order. Perhaps that is the best guarantee that the horrors of the past will not be repeated.'

Slide. Here's the phantom, again. Our gaze at CHR has been fixated on an institution that is no longer there, the Johannesburg Biennale. There are many questions raised by its platforms, questions that are still relevant today, or those that need to be reconstructed for today. The question asked by many, and that is also an overarching critique of the Johannesburg Biennale project, was who was the biennale for. For example, in an article titled 'Behind the Biennale Blues' by a staff writer of the *Mail & Guardian*, dated 12 December 1997, the writer notes, I quote, 'That South Africans should still be defensive in the face of international initiatives on their home turf is perhaps not surprising: ours is still a traumatised society not fully healed by the ideology of rainbowism and the band-aid of sporting victories. The challenge to both local and international cultural producers is to work with our history, to engage it, and perhaps to see biennales as catalysts for that engagement. They are not the conclusive episodes in our past, nor are the only routes to our future. And, like any cultural event, they cannot be the salve for every political and cultural problem. But with sufficient education, and in tandem with other, complementary projects, they could be useful markers in the process of our own making.' Carol Becker, who was then the Dean of Culture at the School of the Art Institute of Chicago, expressed her ambivalence, for which the core was the consent that the second Johannesburg Biennale was in truth so isolated and so perhaps even ultimately irrelevant to what was happening in South Africa, and was largely focused on the diasporic citizens of the world and issues of cultural displacement. A fundamental question she asked then still lingers today: was it possible to realise a biennale in a country not yet a nation?

Part of the problem of not being a nation as yet was perhaps an inability to consider questions of living in close proximity with the enemy, and the stranger, or the neighbour, facilitated by the official end of Apartheid and the opening up of borders to our African neighbours. If these issues were

addressed at all by the Biennale, it was purely in a theoretical framework, for example, the inclusion of Julia Kristeva's essay 'By What Right Are You a Foreigner?' in the accompanying catalogue. But also in Enwezor's potential or personal experiences as a Western-based Nigerian curator in South Africa.

Slide. We devised the *Na Ku Randza* project based on the view through the window. 'Na Ku Randza' is a Tsonga term which means 'I love you'. We developed the project based on the things that we were seeing through the window, and all the activities were also seen through the window. It was held in 2011, and we intended to address the post-traumatic syndrome experienced by people living in South Africa, which included xenophobia, homelessness, unemployment, crime and cross-border migrations. It took place on the site where the pink elephant has witnessed our activities and other happenings, whether we witnessed them ourselves or not. For example, it is the site where the Mozambican Gito Baloi was killed in April 2004, and *Na Ku Randza* is the title of his song, which in English, as I said, means 'I love you'.

Slide. And these are some of the activities of the project that were held during that one day.

Slide. These T-shirts were created right in front of a bus terminal, where buses were leaving every day to go to Zambia, which is a neighbouring country, to Lusaka, which is the main city.

Slide. Basically, it's a packing site during the day, as you can see, and the buses leave in the morning. In the morning these T-shirts were given to the people getting on the bus, so they are somewhere in Zambia, performing perhaps something totally different to what we had imagined.

Slide. Now I want to talk about this small country, which is totally enclosed by South Africa, Lesotho, which you can see on the map. The kingdom of Lesotho is the second smallest and the only landlocked country in Africa, one of three enclaves in the world. During Apartheid, Lesotho served as a temporary home for many South Africans fleeing the oppressive conditions of the regime, and today it exports most of its labour to South Africa. Despite being an independent country, it remains extremely reliant on South Africa.

Slide. The Morija Museum was formally established in 1843 by French missionaries, in response to a growing demand for a space to archive objects. The museum remains the sole archive of the country's history, and is run by a board elected by the church. For the curatorial project *Conversations at Morija*, South African-based Basotho curator Lerato Bereng focused on the diaspora of Lesotho, paying particular attention to those living in South Africa, as it is evident that an alarming percentage of the country's labour lives beyond its borders.

Piggy-begging on the annual music festival taking place in the vicinity of the museum, Bereng also referenced its model, where a recognisable line-up of names of accomplished Basotho based in South Africa and beyond became the primary form of attracting audiences.

Slide. These conversations took place via Skype, in a house recorded as the oldest surviving building in Lesotho, Maeder House.

Slide. Here members of the audience could enter it with invited guests, via Skype, and in case they were shy to ask questions, they were given an option to select questions from Q Cards compiled by Bereng — questions such as, In what way has growing up in Lesotho impacted your understanding of space? Have you been to the Morija Museum and Archives lately? When was the last time you visited? What projects have you done in the country? Do you have plans for future engagements? There are various ways to assess the success of this project. It was highly successful in that, for eight hours, people were fully engaged and flogged between the musical festival and *Conversations*, which at certain points became heated and really interesting. At other times, the *Conversations* and the curatorial premise became a forum for dangerously validating a mythical national consciousness of a nation longing for a pure form.

In *Imagined Communities*, Benedict Anderson makes a point that could be used to reflect on this project: that the members of even the smallest nation will never know most of their fellow members, meet them or even hear them, yet in the mind of each lives the image of their communion. By employing and depending on an apparatus of

cultural fictions, *Conversations at Morija* seems to have reinforced this imagined communion.

Slide. History is a complex subject and an even more complex teacher. To engage history, to quote Khwezi Gule again, it would seem that time needs to be slowed down so that we can move through it a bit more deliberately. How then do we mobilise history in such a way that it becomes a truly transformative exercise? Perhaps it is enough for now simply to tell stories as honestly as we can, and as lyrically as we can, rather than rushing too quickly to monumental and finite conclusions. When eating an elephant, take one bite at a time. Thank you. [Applause]

---

Kian Chow Kwok: I'm pleased to introduce Suha Shoman, who is the co-founder and also the chairperson of The Khalid Shoman Foundation which has developed and is also funding the Darat al Funun art space, that is well known for its artists residency programmes and its publications programme. It has recently published the title *Arab Art Histories*, and has hosted artists from Jordan, Syria, Lebanon, Iraq and Palestine (that includes Gaza) in the art space. Shoman trained as a lawyer (maybe she could help with our problems of legality!) and she is also an artist. She has taken part in the Sharjah Biennale, the Alexandria Biennale and also the Singapore Biennale — whether or not she has worked in the 'secret' museum I don't know! Suha, thank you for your presentation and we look forward to listening to you. Thanks.

---

## Perspective 2

# Suha Shoman

*Biography:* Born in Jerusalem, artist Suha Shoman has lived in Egypt, Lebanon and Jordan. She studied Law in Beirut and Paris, and in 1976 joined the Fahrelnissa Zeid Institute of Fine Arts in Amman. In 1988 she founded and directed The Shoman Foundation non-profit gallery space that aimed at promoting contemporary Arab art, an initiative that led to the opening in 1993 of Darat al Funun, a home for the arts and artists from the Arab world. Her art work has been shown at Les Halles (Brussels, 2008), at the Institut du Monde Arabe (Paris, 2009), at Station Museum and the Kunsthalle Nikolaj (Houston and Copenhagen, 2010), and at The Mori Art Museum (Tokyo, 2011). She also took part in the 2005 Sharjah Biennial and the 2008

Singapore Biennial, and in 2009 was a guest of honour at the Alexandria Biennial.

In 2004 Shoman was awarded the French distinction of Chevalier des Arts et Lettres and in 2006 received the Jordanian Al Hussein Decoration for Distinguished Contribution of the First Degree.

Marhaba, hello! Darat al Funun means a home for the arts: that's what we are and that's what we have been for over twenty-five years. We are a home for the arts that has supported artists from the Arab world at a time when there was no such support. And we are a home for the arts that grew organically, parallel to the needs of artists and the evolving art scene of the Arab world. To present twenty-five years in twenty minutes or slightly longer is almost impossible, so I'm going to focus on key aspects of who we are and what we do. I'm going to start with our twenty-fifth anniversary exhibition, *Hiwar*, which in English means conversations.

Slide. The photo you see here, the poster of the exhibition, is a painting by one of the oldest Palestinian artists, Nicolas Saig, who died in 1942. It represents the surrender of Jerusalem in 1917 to the British; now, one hundred years later, we are actually asked to surrender Jerusalem again. *Hiwar*, curated by Adriano Pedrosa, brought together twenty-nine artists: fourteen emergent artists came from Latin America, Africa, Asia, the Arab world, and fifteen artists from the Arab world, from the collection. The idea was to promote exchange between emerging artists from the margins, not only by showing their art work in an exhibition, as in the case of biennales, but by developing conversations between them and with the curator. The core was to be inspired in and from Amman, as well as from Beirut, Cairo, Cuzco, Istanbul, Johannesburg, Luanda, Manila, Ramallah, Recife, São Paulo... I don't know whether I've forgotten any other names. I will go through some images of the installations.

Slide. This is by Rayyane Tabet, a Lebanese, a fantastic installation he produced during his month's residency at Darat al Funun. It's about the Dead Sea. In 1947 there was a partition of the land, but a partition of the sea as well. The Dead Sea, if you know Jordan, is a very small area, and was divided in three parts: one part for Jordan, one part for Israel and one for Palestine.

Slide. This installation was at our Lab.

Slide. This is the work of the Algerian Rachid el Koraichi, inspired by the poetry of Mahmoud Darwish.

Slide. This is the work of Palestinian Shuruq Harb, an installation about the history of a postcard vendor in Ramallah.

Slide. Mona Saudi. One of the first Jordanian sculptures with her prints.

Slide. This is by Jonathas de Andrade, a Brazilian artist. When he came to the residency at Amman he was astonished to discover that Jesus was not blond, so he started taking pictures of

people in the street, asking them the question 'Who do you think would be a good Jesus?'. People were supposed to add the date and cast their vote. He is quite an exceptional person.

Slide. Bisan Abu Eisheh, a Palestinian artist. This work is about mobile homes and the condition of refugees, particularly Syrian refugees. The photo was inspired by refugee camps in Syria.

Slide. Ahlam Shibli you all know. This is a work from the collection.

Slide. An installation by Akram Zaatari about Saida.

Slide. The work by my teacher and mentor Fahrelnissa Zeid. Adriano chose only the portraits she made, and they are actually portraits of my family, and one work from 1943. This is a very bad reproduction.

Slide. This is a work about the nuclear bomb, by Nguyễn Phong Linh.

Slide. Works by Etel Adnan. She came to the residency at Darat al Funun in 1997 and now her art book and tapestry form part of the collection. I am a great fan of her art books.

Slide. Thabiso Sekgala, from South Africa, sadly passed away just a month ago (he was only thirty-three). As an artist in residence he stayed with us for a month. It was really very sad for all of us.

Slide. Amal Kenawy, an Egyptian artist, also passed away two years ago. This work is in the collection.

Slide. Some of the works in our collection by Mona Hatoum.

Slide. This is a Jordanian artist, Saba Innab, who deals with the issue of urban transformation, alienation and the creation of sectors, class sectors, in modern cities.

Slide. This is a nice combination of works by Daniela Ortiz, who is Peruvian and made a work about censorship, which is a subject that is not easy to discuss, and Abdul Hay Mosallam, a self-taught artist who is eighty years old. His work has now been seen at the New Museum and has been a discovery for some artists. Besides the New Museum, Adriano has displayed his work in the *artevida* [show] in São Paulo, and the Sharjah Foundation is now dedicating an exhibition to him. He will also take part in the Sharjah Biennale.

But to tell you more, I would like you to hear what an artist had to say about his experience at Darat al Funun.

Rayyane Tabet on *Hiwar*: 'I'm here in the context of the exhibition to commemorate the twenty-fifth anniversary of Darat al Funun, and for that show Adriano Pedrosa invited fourteen young

artists mostly from the southern hemisphere of the world, i.e., the margins, to come and have a series of conversations over the course of two months—a new kind of residencies and also more intense discussions between the fourteen of us, in two groups of seven. The space that the Darat offers is both a physical space but also, more importantly, it offers a mental space. A lot of artists, whether they are Arab or not, are definitely artists from the margins and come from places which are fraught with issues that might affect the clarity of your thoughts. So, what I mean by mental spaces is that Darat offers you this oasis in which to think, and that's how I experienced it during the months in which I was here.'

I very much liked what he said about mental space. *Hiwar* reflected our special relationship with artists. We provide them with an open space to learn and experiment, work and produce, exhibit and give talks or workshops. We are a home for them. From the very start in 1988, our non-profit space became a meeting place for Arab artists, some seeking refuge from war and violence in their own countries, others seeking support and exchange with fellow artists. For example Palestinians, who lived through the first Intifada showed their works and gave talks. We organised exhibitions for Iraqi artists who had fled Iraq before and during the first Gulf War, for Lebanese artists who also took refuge in Jordan, and artists from the Arab Mahgreb.

Slide. In the early nineties, to be precise in the period of two years from 1990 to 1992, the late Shakir Hassan al Said, one of the most influential Iraqi artists, conducted a series of lectures on the history and theories of art, which were documented and published in the book *Hiwar al-Fan al-Tashikly*, fittingly titled [Dialogues on Art], the first *Hiwar*. Twenty-five years later, *Conversations in Amman* expanded the scope of [the initial] *Conversation* to include the global south.

Before I show you more about what we do, I would like to show you the Darat al Funun compound where we work.

Slide. When we first started our initiative in 1988 there was little interest in Arab art, unlike today. In Jordan the situation was, and still is, very difficult—we find ourselves, as they say, between a rock and a hard place. There was no faculty of art yet, no art library, no meeting place, and no support for artists. Our first five years were of great importance; they helped us gain the experience needed to pursue our mission and to establish Darat al Funun. In the early nineties we restored three of the oldest buildings in Amman, historical buildings, and the remains of an archaeological site in the Byzantine church.

Slide. The archaeological site was not excavated or registered, so we started from scratch.

It was even used as a garden by the British.

Slide. To give you an example, this is how the main building used to be. It was completely abandoned. From 1921 to 1936 it was the headquarters of the British officers of the Arab Legion. In 1956, at the time of GluBernard Blistène Pasha, it became a club for the officers. That was the time of the Arabisation of the Arab Legion, which considered the south... the political independence of Jordan.

Slide. This is the restoration. We had to start everything from scratch, the church as well.

Slide. Look at the gymnastics the archaeologists had to do to bring in the capital.

Slide. The work on the few remaining mosaics.

Slide. This became the entrance, the lower entrance of Darat al Funun.

Slide. This is the building. The new structure that you see on top is the library. It was the first—and is still the only—art library in Jordan.

Slide. This is how the house ended up, the main building. It's old, inspired in the past, but its glass door says that we are about the present, about modern concepts.

Slide. The library.

Slide. This is the second building, the Blue House. The first was built by a Jordanian, but this one and Dar Khalid were by a Palestinian.

Slide. In 2002 Dar Khalid was dedicated to the memory of Khalid Shoman, the patron of Darat al Funun.

Slide. As you can see, this is the view of the archaeological site with the city [in the background]. We have a fantastic 180° view over the city of Amman, especially with the additions we made. Our restoration preserved our architectural and cultural heritage; it revived the neighbourhood and created a trend in the city for the restoration and reuse of old buildings.

Slide. Almost twenty years later, to accommodate the growing needs of artists, provide a place for researchers and house works from The Khalid Shoman Collection, we restored two more houses, traditional buildings and a series of buildings that became The Lab, an experimental modern space. We also added an apartment building for fellow artists. The first three houses were built consecutively, in 1993, 1994 and 1995, and they are all the living memory of the area.

Slide. This is the result of the restoration of the headquarters and The Lab.

Slide. This is what we call the Beit al Beirut House, the only Lebanese-style house in Jordan, in Amman.

Slide. This is the house after the restoration.

Slide. These houses and the archaeological site are the past, and at the same time, the living

memory of the history of Jordan and the shared common history of the region we call Bilad-ash-Sham, which was Syria, Lebanon, Jordan, Iraq and Palestine, which was disrupted by the Sykes-Picot Agreement. This is the map of our compound. Our compound now covers more than 5000 square metres. Our buildings are equipped with modern technology and the archaeological site is used as a venue for performance art.

In addition to the wide range of exhibitions we mount, we are one of the few private foundations in our region that has a museum-like collection on display in our spaces. We are not though a museum—we invest in art for the sake of art and provide a support system for artists. This is how and why The Khalid Shoman Collection was formed.

Slide. When we started collecting thirty-five years ago, very few collected contemporary Arab art. The Khalid Shoman Collection includes paintings, sculpture, artists' books, photography and video art by established and emerging artists. On occasion of our twenty-fifth anniversary we published the book *Arab Art Histories. The Khalid Shoman Collection*.

Slide. The book consists of three interwoven parts: first, academic essays by scholars from different disciplines examining a range of art historical concerns through art works from the collection; second, personal reflections by artists, curators, architects, performers and friends, who have lived our story and contributed to the making of Darat al Funun; and third, the works by the more than 140 artists forming the collection. It is not a coffee-table book, but a book that reflects on an institutional experience and presents Arab art in an academic approach. The shelves of the library need to be filled with books that study contemporary Arab art. Today there are still very few references to modernism in Arab art, so this too is why in 2011 we established a fellowship for Ph.D. candidates researching Arab art. We fund one or two fellows a year to work at Darat al Funun for a period of four to twelve months, during which they can view the collection, consult our archives and our art library of books, films and publications. Now, about our activities.

Slide. Today with the boom in museums and art initiatives in the region we still provide quite a unique support system for artists. They come in residence, and live in our residency building; they work, use our workshop or our Lab to experiment, produce and exhibit; they give talks, workshops and engage with the public. Many Arab artists held their first solo exhibition in the region at Darat al Funun.

We are currently showing Emily Jacir. It's her first ever survey exhibition and presents works from 1988 to 2014.

Slide. This is *Ex Libris*, the work she

presented at documenta, which you may have seen. The upper windows are the windows of the library. It looks actually quite impressive.

Slide. This is Lydda airport.

Slide. And another work.

Slide. This is another of her works, from *Ex Libris*, a dedication she wrote in the book. We placed many of them on the walls.

We also play an educational role. Years ago, in 1999, we set up a Summer Academy directed by Berlin-based Marwan, that welcomed over sixty artists from the region, including Gaza, but even so it was very difficult to get people out of Gaza. We organised workshops in a wide range of fields, from painting to video art to music. We organised talks conducted by professionals and artists, and programmes for use in guided tours.

I personally like to think of Darat al Funun as a hub for experimentation and innovation; a living place, where art is celebrated and where new histories are in the making. I guess I'm already out of time, so I will leave you with images of our activities. It is said that an image is worth a thousand words.

Slide. This is by the Syrian artist Buthayna Ali, her swing, which you may have seen at the Istanbul Biennale.

Slide. A Jordanian, at work.

Slide. And this is the performance by Amal Kenawy. This was the only time for her film *The Room* that she burnt her wedding dress in the Byzantine church at Darat al Funun.

Slide. Mona Hatoum, this is a work in the collection.

Slide. A performance by Tarek Atoui. He had previously done an eight-month workshop at Amman.

Slide. This is *Sentences on the Bank*, curated by Abdellah Karroum (I guess you know him!). It was a live art exhibition with which Darat al Funun was associated as a lab. It involved many spaces in the city and many activities. At the university, that Abdellah likes very much, we had a seminar on 'Art Practices and Vocabulary', and he organised a radio programme as well. We introduced a rap concert, which was something very daring because rap is forbidden. Another activity was a walk through the city following the paths of a very well known writer. So it was quite a challenging exhibition. Thank you, Abdellah.

Slide. This is the work by the Moroccan artist Mohamed el Baz, an installation which was part of the exhibition and is still there, on site. We had some problems with the Secret Service because of the wording: 'Why do you speak of love?, Why do you dance?', etc. But it is still there.

Slide. This is also from the *Sentences* exhibition, the work by South African artist James WeBernard Blistène *There Is A Light That Never*

*Goes Out*. It's part of the collection and is now on the façade of our headquarters.

Slide. This is one of our activities, a talk by Jack Persekian.

Slide. *Out of Place* was an interesting collaboration with Tate Modern, where we had an exhibition exchange — the exhibition took place in both venues, in London and in Darat al Funun.

Slide. An artist preparing his work.

Slide. The Egyptian artist Hamdi Attia had done a site-specific map at the time of the *Sentences* exhibition but it could not be kept on the site, so I commissioned him to place it elsewhere. It's the map of the world and it's a permanent display as part of our collection. A map of the world as if it had been dissected following the division of the Palestinian territories, so instead of having, for instance, New Zealand, you would have the names of the cities in Palestine. It's quite interesting.

Slide. A concert at the archaeological site.

Slide. I'm going to leave you with some music from a workshop. [Applause]

---

Kian Chow Kwok: Thank you very much. As regards timing, we are doing fine, we are about halfway through our session and have two presentations to go.

Now, the Sursock Museum in Beirut that was established in 1961 is undergoing an extensive renovation and will reopen in 2015. Curator Zeina Arida, whose presentation is next, was formerly Director of the Arab Image Foundation, from 1997 to 2014, and has served as a member of The Arab Fund for Arts and Culture, the Prince Claus Fund Network Partner Committee and the Beit Beirut Museum Scientific Committee. Welcome Zeina. [Applause]

---

## Perspective 3

# Zeina Arida

*Biography:* Zeina Arida is the Director of the Nicolas Sursock Museum in Beirut. The Sursock Museum is a modern and contemporary art museum that has been open to the public from 1961 to 2008, when it temporarily closed for renovation and major expansion in space. Planned for 2015, the reopening of the museum presents an opportunity to build on the museum's history while setting up a platform with a rich and diverse program. From 1997 to mid 2014, Zeina Arida was the Director of the Arab Image Foundation ([www.fai.org.lb](http://www.fai.org.lb)). There, she set-up and managed the Arab Image Foundation and actively took part in many artistic and photographic preservation projects, including the Middle East Photographs Preservation Initiative (MEPPI: [www.meppi.me](http://www.meppi.me)). Arida served as a board member of the Arab Fund for Arts and Culture from 2006 until 2012 ([www.arabculturefund.org](http://www.arabculturefund.org)), and was a member of the Prince Claus Fund Network Partner Committee from 2007 to 2013 ([www.princeclausfund.org](http://www.princeclausfund.org)). She is a member of the Beit Beirut Museum Scientific Committee since 2010 ([www.beitbeirut.org](http://www.beitbeirut.org)).

Hello. When I was invited to speak at the conference I was hesitating between presenting the Arab Image Foundation or the Sursock Museum. I decided to do both because both experiences—or institutions—are relevant to the theme of the panel. They are also, of course, very different. I will perhaps develop this further later. The case of the Arab Image Foundation is interesting in the frame of this conference because it represents a different model of collecting, preserving and serving the public interest, and because this model is very tied to a specific context, which is Lebanon and the postwar period. The Arab

Image Foundation has been collecting, preserving and studying photographs from the Middle East and North Africa since 1997. It is a trans-curatorial and research project and organises activities related to photograph preservation. Seventeen years after its creation, the foundation's archive holds over 600,000 images, including large collections entrusted to it by photographers such as Hashem el Madani from Lebanon, with more than 150,000 negatives, or Kamil and Rifaat Chadirji from Iraq, with a collection of over 100,000 negatives. In some respects, they represent two different ways of

expanding the foundation's collected works: through artistic projects initiated by artists affiliated to the foundation, and through donations made by photographers or collectors.

The Arab Image Foundation was initiated by a group of artists at a very important moment in Lebanon, the nineties, when individuals from civil society set up a number of projects in response to the absence of public cultural institutions and infrastructure, in an effort to contribute to the rebuilding of the country and rethink issues of identity and history. The goal of the founding members was not only to preserve the collected photographic material, but also to study local photographic practices and contribute to the knowledge and diffusion of photography from the Arab world. They were personally interested in learning more about their visual culture, and were concerned about the absence of photographic archives in the region, especially of archives collected, curated and maintained by persons from within the region. We wanted to build an alternative to the visual history defined by the West and fill a gap in the history of photography in the region.

The foundation is a collective of artists which includes, or has included, Akram Zaatari, Fouad Elkoury, Walid Raad, Lara Baladi, Yto Barrada, Jalal Toufic, and other more recently joined members, who were interested in building the collection and reflecting on it. They have pioneered a distinctive approach to collecting that has both a critical and a creative bent. From the beginning, discussions were held as to the possibility of having artists work on archives on a project basis, rather than collecting photographs in traditional fashion. So research was often done for the sake of an exhibition, a publication or a film. Over the years, AIF members have gathered photographic material from a diverse range of sources, from families to professional studios, from photographers to collectors. The result is a dynamic and atypical collection that does not merely illustrate the history of photography in the region, but rather situates a wealth of different photographic practices within a complex context of social, economical, political and cultural factors. Authored by professionals, amateur and anonymous photographers, the collections' images cover a wide scope of genres and styles, including documentary, historical, reportage, industrial and advertising photography. The diverse range of subjects includes architecture, family and studio portraits, fine art, landscape, still life and nudes.

In addition to expanding the collection, the research projects make valuable contributions to the study of photography in the region by collecting information on photographers, their biographies and the conditions informing their practice. Inevitably, these projects raise questions about how images are

used and their relationship to notions such as identity, history and memory. The involvement of the photographers in the Arab Image Foundation as artists but also as board members has definitely influenced the way they approached archives and their own artistic practices. In the symposium *Art as Writing History* co-organised by the Centre Pompidou and the Arab Image Foundation in Beirut in 2012, Clément Cheroux, historian of photography and photographic conservator at Centre Pompidou, introduced the nineteen nineties and the two thousands in Lebanon as a time that witnessed the development of artistic practices which questioned national historical narratives. I quote him: 'The artists of this generation, now mostly in their forties, frequently employ the photographic medium or other derivative analogue technologies such as film and video. They question national historical narratives, upsetting the very notion of narrative and the use of documents while writing and rewriting history and memory, and confusing and blurring past and present.' Those artists developed their practices without a strong institutional framework; they basically created the framework they needed in order to develop and nurture their artistic practices. Festivals, projects, initiatives and exhibitions enabled experimental and politically engaged artistic practices such as Ashkal Alwan, the Arab Image Foundation, the Beirut Theatre, the LAU Festival and others.

Although the Sursock Museum has been open since 1961 and was at the core of artistic life before the war, it was dormant in war times and completely absent from the tremendous cultural changes of the postwar period. During my seventeen years of directorship at AIF, neither me nor my colleagues from other art institutions interacted with the museum. Furthermore, it was the only art museum we had in Beirut. I will not deal with the reasons why there was this quite huge gap, but would prefer to go back to the origin and the history of the museum.

The Nicolas Ibrahim Sursock Museum is a modern and contemporary art museum located in Beirut that opened in 1961. The museum has been closed since 2008 for major renovation and expansion, and is preparing for its reopening, planned for spring 2015. Donated to the city of Beirut in 1951 by a Patrician of the Golden Age after whom it was called, the Nicolas Sursock Museum was assigned an ambitious mission in the donor's will that has the value of a charter: 'As I love fine art and long for its development, particularly in my homeland, Lebanon... As I wish for this country to receive a substantial contribution of fine art works, and that my fellow citizens might appreciate art and develop an artistic instinct... that can only be beneficial and contribute to Lebanon's development. I wish there would exist in Beirut museums and

exhibition rooms open to everyone, where masterpieces and antiques would be preserved and displayed. I, Nicolas Ibrahim Sursock ... set up in the form of *waqf* [trust] all of [my] estate, the personal estate and the real estate, that shall be there at the time of my death... in order that this property and its contents form a museum for arts, ancient and modern, originating from the territory of the Republic of Lebanon, other Arab countries or elsewhere, as well as a space where Lebanese artists' work shall be exhibited... it being understood that this museum shall remain eternally and perpetually'. Just to clarify, *waqf* is an endowment in Islamic law, usually the donation of a building or other assets for charitable purposes, but it is very rare in Lebanon to have a cultural structure as a *waqf*. In return for such a unique philanthropic gesture, the Beirut City Council decided to secure long-term funding for the museum through a law that was voted in the sixties and which gives the museum a share of the taxes perceived by the municipality on work permits deposited in Beirut. Empowered by this unique status, particularly notable in the Lebanese context where, to date, there is no public support [for the arts], the museum opened its doors ten years later, in 1961, with an exhibition of works by Lebanese painters and sculptors — a traditional Autumn Salon, or Salon d'Automne, setting a precedent for cultural events in Beirut. Ever since, the exhibition has been held every year, giving artists the possibility to present their latest creations in a stimulating encounter. The exhibitions offer the public the opportunity to follow and appreciate the evolution of fine arts in Lebanon. They were often occasions for controversy, and sometimes even protest, and were considered one of the major events in the country's artistic life.

The museum's collection is organised into four primary categories: modern Lebanese art, contemporary Lebanese art, works by the artist Assadour Bezdikian, and works by French, German, Italian and Japanese artists. In addition to this, the museum has an eclectic collection of Islamic art, tapestries, textiles, rare books and manuscripts, and other artefacts.

I will say a few words about the modern Lebanese painting collection. Predominantly consisting of works on paper and canvas, the modern Lebanese art collection also includes sculpture, installations and mixed media from key modern Lebanese artists. The works held by the collection are often considered to be those that are most representative of an artist's body of work. I can give you a few examples, such as Shafic A Bernard Blistèneoud, Farid Awad, Amin el Bacha, Etel Adnan, Halim Jurdak, Aref el Rayess. Importantly, a number of the early pioneers are also represented. These include Daoud Corm, Najib Kikano, Habib Srour,

Philippe Mourani and Khalil Saleeby. Most of the mid-to-late twentieth-century pieces were either donated or purchased after their inclusion in the Salon d'Automne. The collection of Lebanese art from the first half of the twentieth century is significant as its scope enables an overview of the history of modernism in Lebanon. In certain ways, the works in the collection are suggestive of the Lebanese history of modern and contemporary art: the predominance of portraiture and oil on canvas in the early twentieth century, the significance of Alba, which was the first art academy training a generation of artists who emerged in the mid-twentieth century, and the subsequent choice of formal languages; a diverse interest in abstraction in the mid-to-late twentieth century, the strong presence of self-taught artists, a continued legacy of painting into the contemporary period with a particular focus on Realism and Expressionism, the presence of foreign and specifically French artists through the history of art in Lebanon, and the significant role of Armenian artists in forging a modern and contemporary art movement.

In other ways, the collection excludes characteristics defining art in Lebanon, *al-hurufiyya*, or the experiments with Arabic letters, the presence of Palestinian artists and of art produced in solidarity with the Palestinian cause throughout the second half of the twentieth century, the work of prominent modernists such as Saliba Douaihy, Helen Khal and Huguette Calande, and in the contemporary period, artists working with archives and the history of contemporary Lebanon.

I'm not going to talk about what I aim to do at Sursock Museum, as I don't have time, although it might come up later during the discussion. I would rather share with you some of the questions I've been asking myself lately. The current context in Lebanon is very interesting — it's a different moment to the nineties, but we are also witnessing a number of new projects aimed at creating private and semi-public art institutions and museums. I will name a few, such as the American University of Beirut, APEAL, etc. A few countries from the Gulf have donated funds for Lebanon to create these cultural institutions: Oman, Qatar and Kuwait have backed the projects of the House of Arts and Culture, the National Library [an initiative of the Ministry of Culture] and the Ethnographic Museum. We still have no idea of how these public museums and centres are going to be set up, and we still have to prove that we can make public institutions function.

To get back to the Sursock Museum, I would say it has a long history and a significant collection of Lebanese art, although I don't know if this makes it more relevant or legitimate today than the other projects I've mentioned. It's a question I pose. The

museum is a semi-public institution and I wonder in what kind of position this places the museum in comparison with other private collections and museums. Along with the institutionalisation of the Lebanese art scene, which was mentioned several times yesterday, may we think that Beirut is heading towards a major change in its cultural landscape? Yesterday, Mayssa Fattouh asked the question 'Does Beirut need a museum?' I think it's a very relevant question, but I would pose it differently, 'Who needs museums in Beirut?' Precisely because I have struggled for over seventeen years to sustain the Arab Image Foundation, I have fund-raised for it and suffered from the lack of public support and of cultural infrastructure, it is important for me to think about the museum today in Beirut as a professional

platform that provides a community of artists, scholars and independent initiatives with much needed institutional support. I believe that later, on the panel, we can discuss the questions related to this huge change in Beirut. [Applause]

---

Kian Chow Kwok: Actually, my fellow board member Abdellah is one of the most hard-working people I know! He has been working so hard organising this conference and yet he is also doing multiple presentations. Thank you very much!

---

## Perspective 4

# Abdellah Karroum

*Biography:* Curator and writer Abdellah Karroum (1970, the Rif, North Africa) was appointed Director of Mathaf - Arab Museum of Modern Art of Doha in 2013. Karroum has founded and directed a number of artistic initiatives, including éditions hors'champs series of art publications (1999), Le Bout Du Monde (art expeditions to different locations, from 2000 onwards), L'appartement 22, an experimental space for exhibitions and artists' residencies (Rabat, 2002), and the R22 experimental web radio station (2007). At the 3rd Marrakech Biennale he presented *A Proposal for Articulating Works and Places* (2009), and for Darat Al Funun art centre, besides other activities, he curated *Sentences on the Banks* (Amman, 2010). Karroum was artistic director of *Inventing the World: The Artist as Citizen* (Biennale Régard Benin, 2012) and associate curator of *Intense Proximity* for La Triennale (Paris, 2012). His curatorial project *Sous nos yeux* was presented at La Kunsthalle - Centre d'art contemporain Mulhouse (2013) and at Museu d'Art Contemporani de Barcelona (2014). One of his latest projects is *Shirin Neshat: Afterwards* (2014) and he is currently working on a Wael Shawky solo exhibition for Mathaf (2015).

Thank you K. C. I will not stand on this podium for long, as I don't want to give another talk. And also, because you are here in Doha, I prefer to talk to you in Mathaf, on site, so you can see the art works, the spaces, share different things, talk about exhibitions and collections. I will only show a few images. Consider them as flashes, and then you will see the real sites.

Slide. So this is where we are, the situation, the Mathaf building with the performance space just next to it, in Education City, Qatar Foundation. The university is also nearby. This is one version of the Qatar Foundation master plan, so it doesn't exactly match the area as it is today. It has changed but, as you can see, Mathaf is part of the urban

development of the city. This plan is one of the projections for the future, and in this version we see a lot of green space — a golf course, a National Library in this area, different facilities. I'm not sure how much these match the real buildings today because the plans progressed, but a lot of them have been completed, such as the university building where we are now. Here is the road that gives access to Mathaf. This is just to show you our geographical situation within the city.

Slide. Before the architecture, I would like to talk about the concept of the Arab Museum of Modern Art — *mathaf* in Arabic is museum — and its origin. Maybe some of you attended the discussion yesterday with His Excellency Sheikh Hassan, about

our origin. In the eighties he was doing a lot of travelling, visiting museums and collections around the world, and back in his own country, Qatar, he wanted to continue seeing art. This morning we were talking about the need for projects and institutions and how these are created. In this case, Sheikh Hassan's desire to see art works led to the need for a place. He began a collection and wanted a place for the art, a 'home' as he calls it. This building is not the first [to house the works], as previously there were two villas in Madinat Khalifa, not far from here, similar to Suha Shoman's houses at The Khalid Shoman Foundation in Amman. Such projects always start somewhere, they start with a need and an initiative, and Mathaf follows this model: there is a need and there is a projection, a desire to share what we like and use art to create an institution, a place for learning and for sharing.

Slide. As the collection began to grow, the founder Sheikh Hassan felt the need to share it and suddenly the whole country was working around the collection. He donated the first part of it to Qatar Foundation, and the foundation continued to collect and reached an agreement with Qatar Museums, the two largest institutions developing cultural projects, universities and museums in Qatar.

Today the collection continues to grow as part of Qatar Museums. The first group of works consisted of approximately 5000, a number that has now risen to over 8000, collected by Qatar Museums. So both umbrella institutions, Qatar Foundation and Qatar Museums, invest in Mathaf. The team is composed of museum professionals in exhibition making, conservation, education, etc. Qatar Museums is the institution that connects the different museums in the country and provides specialised professional support, while Qatar Foundation provides structural and infrastructural support, the buildings, maintenance, etc. The fact of being in Education City is an opportunity for us. We are surrounded by at least four university buildings, and to a great extent our audiences are composed of students, we organise numerous workshops, etc.

Slide. Now the architecture, the façade. This is the site that you saw. This building was formerly a school and was then transformed into a museum. The façade has this kind of scaffolding because from the very beginning in 2010 it opened as a temporary building and now, four years later, it still is a temporary building. There is a project for a new building that will house both temporary exhibitions and the collection. Inside, the focus is on education—the collections are displayed in a didactic way, as you will see. This is Adam Heinien's work, a large sculpture by the Egyptian artist who was taking part in the Aswan International Sculpture Symposium. This is by Ismail Fattah from Iraq, and this metallic sculpture is by Mohammed Sami from

Kuwait. All the works existed before the building existed, and are integrated with it. This kind of boat, *The Ship* by Adam Heinien, acts as a group of works but also as a large installation.

Slide. Some of the works in the collection. This is by Dia Azawi, an Iraqi artist.

Slide. The displays of the collection at Mathaf are sometimes designed by the curatorial team, sometimes by the research team and sometimes in collaboration with the education team. The building is very small—the entire surface is roughly 5000m<sup>2</sup> inside, but we only use about half of it for the exhibitions, at both levels and in the education spaces. It is small, so the exhibitions can't contain more than two hundred works.

Slide. This is one of the displays of the collection.

Slide. Each exhibition involves research and is accompanied by a publication. Our catalogues are produced in collaboration with our research team and guest researchers.

Slide. Every year, the education programme concludes with an exhibition of works from the students' art competition. This is last year's show. Each one has a topic, and this one was 'Black and White'. The Education Department is a very important department at Mathaf.

Slide. Here the education space is transformed into an exhibition space.

When I arrived at Mathaf a year and a half ago, one of the new projects consisted in creating new spaces within the actual museum. Our building has a very important and recognised collection, and with my curator colleagues we thought of creating a space for dialogue and debate for our staff. We now have five different teams at Mathaf and we needed a space for experimentation, a space in which to work with younger artists, artists of my generation and younger, people from all the museum's departments. So we suggested this Project Space, which is one of the rooms on the ground floor. For one of the first projects we invited Manal Al Dowayan from Saudi Arabia, who was co-curator with Laura Barlow, one of the curators at Mathaf. Manal Al Dowayan came with a very important topic she had been working on in Saudi Arabia about women who had died in car crashes. The project itself was called *Crash*, and was dedicated to women teachers who taught far from their home cities and, not being allowed to drive, had to rely on drivers and were often involved in accidents. It was a very complex story, but we gave her several weeks to think about [how to present] the project and also invited students to reflect on this social issue that lead to discussions on women's rights, etc. So this is a space for experimenting, formulating [ideas] and finding a language that can at once inform and become a form of production for artists themselves. In this case, the artist produced this large map of Saudi

Arabia, showing roads and new roads. One of the interesting topics that was raised, and is often raised with artists, was the origin of the transformation of landscape and how in Saudi Arabia and in many other countries infrastructures are built to meet the demands of the oil industry, which provides an income, and the need to educate the population in each [town and] village. The research involved drawing up inventories, statistics, articles for journals, etc. The second project was by Ghadah Alkandari from Kuwait, the *Doha Art Map*. We used the space to think of the artistic initiatives that exist in Doha today, the places people can visit to see art, express themselves and build something. The idea is to identify spaces that can be art centres, galleries, residencies. We can talk about this on site.

Slide. Another research project. The image is cropped, but this is a beta version of what we call the *Mathaf Encyclopedia of Modern Art and the Arab World*, initiated by the museum's Research Department. It's a project that was proposed in the early days of the conception of the museum by a group of researchers with Sheikh Hassan that included Nada Shabout, who was working with us here and is still involved in the project along with other researchers. I think Salwa Mikdadi also forms part of the group. We work with professors and Ph.D. students. Our goal is to have the maximum number of biographies. Today in the beta version we have about forty or fifty biographies that have already been published or are about to be published, and we hope to have about two or three hundred in next year's business plan (just to give you some statistics). All the textual content is in English and Arabic and is accompanied by videos, photos from private collections, exchange agreements with galleries, artists' families, etc. So this is one of the projects that have no clear-cut borders. There is no conflict between public and private institutions — private owners can keep their documents and we can work with galleries who give us their documentation for us to publish without there being any conflict of interests.

Slide. One of the new spaces is this performance space, where we held the sessions on the first day of the conference. This photograph was taken during the Etel Adnan opening, at the performance where the Qatar Philharmonic Orchestra played a piece by Gavin Bryars to a poem by Etel Adnan.

To talk about this kind of expansion, the area of Mathaf you saw contains some other buildings now used as storage that are becoming new museum spaces. As long as we have the need, we have to think about Mathaf Museum's expansion and development in Education City. Qatar Foundation today has a think-tank team reflecting on how to

create a cultural zone within this new area of Doha, both physically and in terms of our artistic offer for the entire city. You can find all this information on our website, which we try to update as often as possible.

One of our objectives as a museum and an important presence within Education City and the city of Doha is to make art (art in general, and our artistic programme in particular) a part of people's daily lives. I will conclude here so we can also have some discussion later. Thank you. [Applause]

Kian Chow Kwok: Thank you very much. We're going to have a Q&A as well as a panel discussion after lunch. Again, as regards timing we are almost on the dot, so now we'll go for lunch, but before that I would just like to say something briefly.

In this morning's session we have really seen a spectrum of art spaces, museums and institutions, public and private, in different configurations. In Zeina's presentation, for instance, the Sursock Museum in Beirut is considered a semi-public museum. Most of the initiatives discussed are private museums, or private initiatives. I suppose, Abdallah, that yours is considered a public museum. We're not saying, of course, that the spectrum that we've seen is a pattern for the region. Nevertheless, they provide us with the scope to think about the question of public and private, which is very much the theme of this conference.

It is interesting that in the museum world we are so tied to the question of ownership, presumably because of collections, because museums come from their own institutional history, from the idea of treasures, of treasures being shared with the public, and are therefore centred on the idea of collections. However, we are not talking much about non-governmental organisations or civil society as in other sectors. So perhaps this is now an opportunity for us to leave the question of public versus private a little bit, and think further about the purposes and functions of art spaces, museums and so on, to be able to then return to the question of what the possible division between public and private may mean.

In this morning's session we were also interested in looking at the problem of history, as in Gabi's presentation, and her concern about museums being related to what she calls 'monumental' history, while we should actually be going slow in order to experience history.

Suha's presentation also looked at the consolidation of the art history—which should of course be art 'histories'—of the Arab region. This also brings forth the question of regionalism, as we try to see how institutions focus on locale, but are

also able to relate to the broader context of the country and to the rest of the world, i.e., from the regional level to the national and transnational levels.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the thirty-one CIMAM members for joining us from all over the world. Welcome! You have come from everywhere (from Lithuania to Sudan, from Chile to Hong Kong) and it is very important that you share your experiences when we discuss these questions because you all work in institutions, and engage with institutional processes in one way or another, so that collectively we will be able to take this whole discussion further when we come back after lunch for the panel discussion. Enjoy your lunch! [Applause]

---

# Building Institutions in the African and Middle East Contexts

Kian Chow Kwok: Shall we start? I hope you enjoyed your lunch. For the next one and a half hours we will have the panel discussion. The Q&A for the morning session will be included in the panel discussion. As I explained earlier, we will have Salwa [Mikdadi], Suha [Shoman], Zeina [Arida], Mayssa [Fattouh] and Antonia [Alampi] on stage. Thank you very much Abdellah [Karroum] and Gabi [Ngcobo], they are on standby. Please feel free to ask them questions too. From the morning session as well, Ute [Ute Meta Bauer], if you would like to participate and the audience would like to ask you questions, I hope that would be fine too. Again, as I just mentioned, we really hope that the international participants from all over the world will share their experiences, their institution-building and various concerns with us.

So, we have seen a range of institutions, very specific ones such as Suha's Darat al Funun and Zeina's Sursock Museum and the Arab Image Foundation. And of course Abdellah's Mathaf, and what Gabi presented about the Johannesburg Art Gallery and the Center for Historical Re-enactments, what she calls White Elephant, Pink Elephant — and we should chew elephants slowly!

Mayssa, of course, is from the Katara Art Center here in Doha, and Antonia is from the Beirut art space in Cairo. So can I invite the four of them on stage before the rest of you are 'on' again. [Laughter]

We have looked at many issues, both yesterday and today, issues specific to building institutions such as, for instance, how we work with artists; the institutional positioning of various types of specific institutions; the role of collections (which includes art works, archives, documentation); museum audiences and on-site audiences, local, national and transnational audiences; public and the difference between audience and public. We have further concerns about administrative culture and were discussing yesterday reviews and assessments, and how these influence museum processes. This morning we were talking about professionalism, which is very important in terms of something that is out there as a standard to which local developments can make reference, and local

developments can, of course, also inform the formation of such professionalism. This is why we are here. So, shall we begin? Maybe we can start with Zeina and that quick discussion we were having earlier, and then take it from there.

Zeina Arida: I was talking about the idea of the institutionalisation of the initiatives set up in the nineties, such as Ashkal Alwan, the Arab Image Foundation, and returning to the discussion we began yesterday with Mayssa about how this change will impact the production of art and how artists work in Beirut, I think it's a very interesting discussion. On the one hand, the institutionalisation of our initiatives is very important to secure the sustainability of these projects — when these initiatives are only linked to individuals, which is very often the case in Lebanon, what happens when the individuals want to go elsewhere, or can simply handle no more fund-raising for, say, twenty years? And on the other hand, it really is a completely new way of producing and discussing art. So I think it's a very important and interesting debate.

Massya Fattouh: My question was rather the role of the museum in an art scene where artists have thrived regardless of the existence of museum, not so much whether we should or shouldn't have a museum. There's no doubt that a museum should exist, whatever the nation or the national speech that it is addressing, because we know there is no government in Lebanon but, despite that, I think the chaotic situation is very interesting. Taking the chaos as a starting point, in relation to what Salwa had mentioned here in terms of systems, I'm currently in the middle of co-founding a mobile platform in Beirut, and the fact that there's no system kind of encouraged and triggered the sense of urgency to create such a mobile platform, that has no roots in terms of systems. It can only exist in a country like Lebanon, in comparison with the GCC [Gulf Cooperation Council]. Now, whether it's sustainable or not — it has no physical space, no physical space, and the GCC does not yet offer that freedom for small initiatives to exist. I think we should maybe question of what is independent in countries like the Gulf: how can we define that term

when private and public are intermingled? How can the museum really collaborate closely with small initiatives, and each learn from the other?

Kian Chow Kwok: I think this really relates to yesterday's discussion about the kind of administrative structure within which museums operate. There is the managerialism of assessments, reviews and so on. Now, what we are saying here is with institutionalisation a frame is being created, a certain system and structure, so does it or does it not have an impact on art practices? Massya was saying that in a situation of chaos, maybe the institution is not necessary, because artists are already doing what they have to do. The imposition of institutions, however, on the one hand helps artists, but on the other creates new kinds of restrictions and impositions. Now you are asking whether the frame of the GGC, which is the Gulf Cooperation Council, quite a strong geopolitical framework, really has an impact on art practice. To consider it from the museum perspective, do you allow your framework to require artists to perform in a certain way in order to fit into this framework? Or do you negotiate with this framework to say how art should be created? So, we must return to respect for artists and for the context of chaos in which they have been working.

Mayssa Fattouh: It is a tricky question, and often how we address or how we produce is linked to who funds us. That's why I posed the question of sustainability — whether this platform will be sustainable or not is a big concern. But we're trying to operate regardless of who funds the platform, and focus on the subject matter itself, trying to give as much freedom to artists to produce outside the constraints of funding issues. But of course those are very small platforms. I operate on the small scale rather than the large or spectacular scale, and whoever joins in this should be aware of the financial constraints in terms of how big or small we can produce. I think maybe Antonia can say something about this.

Antonia Alampi: Give that the subject is the museum, before we actually discuss relationship between the museum and artists, what is the relationship between museums and authority that actually allows for the existence of museums? This includes funders, a certain legal system, a system of networks, etc. I think the moment we start being transparent as regards what kind of relationships make institutions such as museums possible, maybe we can actually rethink the structures of museums as such in different contexts. I can speak mostly of Cairo, my experience is extremely personal — I've been living and working in Cairo for the last two years, but I can't speak for the region at large. So, thinking of Cairo, or of Egypt, as there is no museum of contemporary art in the whole country, there is no

freedom of speech, there is censorship and a complete lack of so-called democratic institutions, would a museum with a centralised structure dependent on the government make any sense in the first place? Could we rethink the structure of the museum, for instance, with a widespread infrastructure? A museum that does not have a centralised governance [structure] but is actually governed by a number of smaller institutions? I'm speculating, I'm brainstorming here, but I think the premise of its infrastructure and mode of functioning needs to be thought of in relation to the characteristics of the context, which are numerous and have a huge number of components.

Kian Chow Kwok: I'd like to invite comments now, because the point here is, at the level of multiple museums in a city or a country, do we look at a kind of central authority, a form of centralisation with an overarching administrative structure for museums? And how does that translate into smaller art spaces, individual art practices? Is that an encouraging environment from the perspective of artistic practice, or not? I think that's the issue here, and I'm inviting comments from different parts of the world in terms of how you feel about the situation in your own cities. Anyone, please?

Rachel Dedman: I work in Beirut, I'm based in Lebanon (so I'm not from a different part of the world!). I suppose what Antonia was saying made me think about this question of endurance, because I work for a small art space or research platform in Beirut called 98 Weeks, that really began as a research centre rather than as a gallery, and which hosts multidisciplinary events and talks and is really pursuing research forms on a biannual basis. And so I wonder, as we apply for funding and go through all processes that we are all familiar with and resent, what the point is long-term. I think we assume that endurance, the institutionalisation of spaces, is always a positive thing, something unquestionably good, but with 98 Weeks I wonder whether actually placing ourselves in the institutional box would be necessary in order to have funding? Is that ultimately in its interest? Perhaps what Beirut really needs is a space that isn't afraid to transform, and shift, and change according to the changing conditions within the city, not necessarily to attempt to secure its own future. There may come a time when it no longer needs to exist because it's fulfilled its purpose within the city — I don't know. Maybe this won't happen, but its institutionalisation, or its becoming something permanent is something I think we need to question and at times challenge. It's not always the way it should be. To me, these spaces need to constantly respond and react to the conditions, the situations and the contexts in which they find themselves, and the needs of the local populace, whatever that may be. Thank you.

Suha Shoman: May I say something? I guess we have to think of the wording of things. First of all, we're not only speaking of museums, but what is a museum of today? What is its role? I remember when the Centre Pompidou...

Salwa Mikdadi: To be pragmatic, there is the ideal situation, in which all systems are in place and we have a fantastically running ecosystem, which doesn't exist anywhere. It seems that we're talking about two different things: current smaller institutions that are run by individuals—pioneers such as Soha for example, who will continue to sustain themselves for some time—and the issue of the basic systems that need to be in place and that we can't do without. When I mention cultural policy I am referring to a policy that would allow the free movement of artists within the region. Several years ago we started a residency programme in Abu Dhabi to bring in artists and writers from other Arab countries, and it has been difficult. This is why it's so important for governments to have cultural policies that allow free movement of artists, writers and thinkers, and art works probably too, in the region. Cultural policy is one of the many policies that need to be instituted and approved by parliaments. And this is something that may or may not be attainable in the near future, but that doesn't mean that we don't continue thinking about it. Meanwhile, as I said yesterday, in the region we have to be flexible and versatile. As discussed yesterday, okay we do these mobile projects, pop-up projects in different places, that may not have a longevity but actually serve their purpose in current times and in our conditions.

The best and most innovative solutions are found in Lebanon—where people are very creative in adversity—in the way they have managed to maintain these institutions over a long period of time. What happened in the process is that they have mentored the younger generation, who are here among us today and who we hope will continue until the systems are in place and we have the proper institutions for them to work in. We must be positive.

Zeina Arida: I wanted to go back to what Rachel was saying about some projects not having to be continuous or sustainable. I totally agree actually—some projects just stop and should be able to stop. I think that as a museum or cultural institution maybe the biggest challenge is to reflect the changes in artistic practices, contexts and political situations. At the Arab Image Foundation, for instance, we've been thinking about this a lot since the Arab Spring. We're a group of individuals, we all change, we all evolve, so how we can also reflect this change within institutions, their programme and their relationship to the public?

Kian Chow Kwok: Okay, I'll come to you shortly. It seems that here we generally agree (at least I hope so!) on having institutions as a

foundation, which we need because of continuity and sustainability, for they create a kind of framework and system that will facilitate and support art practices. However, there may be issues and there certainly will be issues and you will not be perfect, so in this ecology that we are creating probably the next step we are now moving to is the relationship between different kinds of institutions within the ecology. Generally, there are larger ones, smaller ones, and so on. So, if you could share [with us] the nature of these dynamics between different kinds of institutions in your own cities, and how they help or don't help artistic development within the larger systemic framework. Can we have your comments?

Reema Fada: I think you skipped me a beat! My name is Reema Fada and I work for the Guggenheim Abu Dhabi, but I was going to comment on this issue of the necessity for continuity in terms of my own experience with artists working in Ramallah, where continuity is very much challenged. Working at the Khalil Sakakini Cultural Center from 1999 to 2003 I remember facing the Israeli incursion, when the actual army entered the space of the cultural centre, bombarded it and caused such immense damage to the infrastructure that it erased it completely. That is something that I keep being reminded of, that we had to start from scratch, in very different circumstances, to build these institutions at once and build all the initiatives. The Ministry of Culture was in the same situation. There's a fake understanding of that institutional structure. There is a burning question in my mind about the amnesia that occurs, in terms of how you start to build from those institutional efforts some form of narrative that overarches and can also transcend certain borders or geographies. There is a level at which that the museum as a project consolidates these geographic borders, or ways of creating connections of narratives. Many people here who are from the Arab world will not in their lifetime be able to visit Palestine or different spaces in the Middle East because of visa issues, for example. There are real political challenges and, as regards stability and security, certain structures can afford something that could be a lesson in terms of narrative. Looking at cultural contributions, which have been totally lost, and at these connections and understandings can provide real lessons.

Mayssa Fattouh: I think this is a pressing question at the heart of this platform that, as you're aware, I'm in the middle of co-funding right now. How does one address collective memory in a place that is constantly physically endangered? And how do you go beyond the physical infrastructure and enter the public realm in a direct way? I agree with you. I wouldn't be able to say there's an answer to it, but it lies at the heart of other initiatives as well. I think, for instance, a good example that does not

speaking about the Arab region is also Creative Time, which plays a more activist role that connects more directly with the public and functions throughout the public. I'm not familiar with things that are happening in Ramallah. I don't know whether that emphatically answers your comment.

Zeina Arida: I think it would have been great to have had someone from The Palestinian Museum with us, because it's a very interesting initiative, this museum that has been built for the memory of Palestinians and which probably many Palestinians will be unable to visit. I think the way they're approaching the building of the museum, collecting and relying greatly on an online platform they're creating, is interesting. Maybe someone can tell us a little more about it.

Salwa Mikdadi: The idea is that there will eventually be satellites, in Jordan, northern Palestine and Lebanon. These would be the first satellites, which would expand to other communities of Palestinians, but clearly the Internet is the widest, the best way to reach out to diverse and refugee communities, as is the case now with Syrians, Iraqis and others. Let's not forget that more Lebanese live outside Lebanon than in Lebanon.

Antonia Alampi: To respond to Reema also, I think it raises some interesting question in terms of how we speak of continuity while acknowledging the need to be institutionally extremely fluent, and have the capacity to be transformative because the political and the economical situation actually require us to continually rethink the structure that we're trying to establish. So almost as soon as you feel you've reached something, you actually face the challenge of having to change again. And at times that can imply changes in place, unfortunately, along with many other things.

Kian Chow Kwok: And of course, this structure could be on the Internet, it could be pre-infrastructure, multiple locales, satellites or simply diasporic communities, and so on. The word that I heard just now was consolidation, and museums are very important places of consolidation. Now, however that takes shape, whether in concrete buildings or on the Internet, we still need museums. We have several questions; maybe from the back?

Varda Nisar: Hi. I come from Pakistan and we have a total of two museums: one private, the Mohatta Palace Museum, whose agenda and whose programme has yet to be defined, which doesn't even have a collection of its own, and the National Museum [of Pakistan], which I think has not changed its displays since the nineteen eighties. I feel that we need government museums for the impact that they can create. Through their policy they can act on a larger scale and have a greater influence than private projects. That would be the ideal situation, though I realise that private initiatives exist primarily

because there is a space for them to exist where neither the government nor the private sector are playing their part. But in Third World countries we see that the narrative is changing constantly: the narrative differs in the case of democratic and military governments. So, how are museums and art practitioners supposed to respond in these spaces? I think that what has happened with private initiatives in the Third World is that governments have let go of their responsibilities, and the private institutions that began to develop in the Third World were playing the role that governments should have played. I would just like somebody to please comment on this.

Jo-Anne Bernie Danzker: Jo-Anne Bernie Danzker from Seattle. I can't comment on the question that you're asking, but I would like to come back to the challenge that you launched at us, which is what models are we looking at? In our discussion so far we've been talking about museums as they were constructed in the nineteenth century. That model is like a department store, which is in the process of a long and painful demise, and in times of danger or of extreme conditions, which can be economic, which can be physical (you can live in an earthquake zone or be in a state of war), one of the key things which I think we really need to do is to understand what function, or what responsibilities and duties museums have and, potentially, in the conditions under which you're working, is to decentralise them. The way that you are then able to fulfil those collective duties that have traditionally been associated with the museum can be much more effective. You're talking about archives, you're talking about observing art objects, you're talking about establishing narratives for the time, you're talking about access, and if we liberate ourselves from the museum as a model and start to look at those functions being perhaps distributed to different parts of the country, or protected in different ways, and the responsibilities being in some cases placed in units, then we can have a museum with a time limit or an expiry date. We can function with expiry dates that can respond to the particular conditions. As a scholar and a researcher who is constantly dealing with materials that have been destroyed, one of the primary responsibilities I think we have collectively is to store knowledge and protect objects for the future. But the role of living in a state of uncertain outcomes is true for all of us, and this role that we all have to address, those social, political and cultural issues, are something that doesn't require the 'box', the big box [the traditional museum], which is the most unsafe location for most of the preservation and conservation of materials that one would need.

Antonia Alampi: To respond to the last comment, I completely agree with the idea that this

is not something that relates only to Egypt, the area or the region. I'm Italian, and I would say that the relationship between cultural practices and politics is quite controversial in that sense as well. Modes of governance, for instance.

I don't think we need to reconsider the forms, structures or patterns that we select only in the confines of this region, but I think it's an urgent issue that probably applies to all of us, including the continuously changing political situation, the financial situation, the funding structures we depend on, new ethics that we should also be thinking about, the ethical aspects that also seem to be asking us to take positions opaque with in the past, or not so open about, etc. I think there are examples all around the world, especially in the last two years, that are kind of openly asking for that. I don't know if anyone wants to respond to her also, it's a really difficult question!

Kian Chow Kwok: Let's go back to the Pakistan museum. Varda, right? First of all, let me ask, are you're talking about a history museum or an art museum? Or is there no difference?

Varda Nisar: The National Museum consists of both art and archaeological objects.

Kian Chow Kwok: Okay. The National Museum includes art as well as history.

Varda Nisar: And the other one is only of art.

Kian Chow Kwok: The issue here is that a change of government implies a change of narrative because the museum is taken as a national institution.

Varda Nisar: It's a national institution, but we need to realise that these places have always been used as a propaganda machine as well. I think that this holds especially true for South Asia: we do use these things, we use our newspapers, we use every single piece of machinery available to us as a means of propaganda. We saw that early in the nineteen eighties when we changed from a liberal state to a very Islamic state and were continuously revising our image to make it one of truly traditional women, in a conservative mode. So our museums play that role. We hid our Buddhist artefacts at that time. Even today, we are debating whether to date our history back to 700 AD, when Islam entered the region, or to start with the Kandahar region. People deny that history now, and therefore deny the art in that regard, so the role that the museums are playing is very weak and private initiatives can never assume that scale in this region, considering all the problems with funding, [the difficulties in] having the sort of space to do what they should be doing.

Kian Chow Kwok: Yes.

Bartomeu Marí: Thank you. I think, like rock 'n' roll, museums can be an instrument for liberation, but they can also be instruments for submission. Probably the relationship between [history] museums and art museums and national projects

required these institutions, or the institution of the museum in general, to be analysed under the umbrella of decolonisation, from all forms of dominance and submission.

Kian Chow Kwok: Now, may I take this question of narrative in art museums further? We can understand that history or national museums have a kind of national narrative, but how do you express a national narrative in art? Is there a national art history? Anyone, yes.

Gordon Knox: My name is Gordon Knox and I'm Director of the Arizona State University. It's really exciting that this conversation has brought us to this interesting division point because indeed, the rock 'n' roll that enslaves, as Bartomeu suggested, is very much associated with the creation of the myth, the origin myth, the support of the state, the national image of what we are. Both natural history and social history museums can be very much a container into which we are forced. But the particular intellectual effort that we take on, art, the sort of evolutionary role of that enterprise has always included a huge component of the critical stance. Instead of the support of the status quo at its time it's almost always looking to overturn, undermine or reimagine the status quo. And it is that dynamic, that energy, that aspect of transformation which I actually think provides the species with adaptability. That very sense of flexibility and ability to reconceive how we conceive makes it difficult to put into the box that we call museum. So we need to start thinking about that expiry date, we need to start thinking about what art does and energising it, making it an element of social action by putting it back out into the street maybe for a period of time that's brief, not necessarily these long historical moments. I think the concept of history and the concept of art have their own internal tension and part of that is being brought up in this conversation.

Kian Chow Kwok: I think there are probably two really interesting aspects here. On the one hand, the critique of a nineteenth-century model of museum and the idea that we should get out of there fast! On the other hand, in the case of Pakistan and probably also some other places, we have national governments wanting to develop museums as part of a process of modernisation, as part of becoming complete as a nation, with all these institutional features. What you're saying also is that there is a kind of criticality, a flexibility that is already making its way into the heritage of art museums, and therefore what we need to do is to ensure that it becomes a part of [our] professionalism. So when a new museum is developed in a locale—once again, it's one thing to have an art museum, and another to have a national narrative—the development of such a museum must negotiate the kind of museological norm that must include this dimension of criticality. I

think that's the other part. I think we are now dealing with these two parts, which personally I find truly interesting. Anyone? Yes.

Kate Fowle: Kate Fowle, Garage Museum in Moscow. I think this is a very very interesting conversation, but I wonder if we can bring CIMAM into it. What strikes me is that through CIMAM we can all come and experience and learn about what's happening in different places, but I also think that there's a role that CIMAM could be taking on—and CIMAM is thinking about—in terms of how to help advocacy or how to support or structure ways in which it is possible not to have this kind of random idea 'You're a museum, and you're not a museum'. So I wonder if any of the people on the board of CIMAM could talk a little about their thinking in hearing this and what potential there is for CIMAM to help.

Madeleine Grynsztejn: It's Madeleine Grynsztejn, Museum of Contemporary Art [Chicago]. I'll take the hit! First, however, I think it's worth remembering that the board is made up of our own peers, so we're not sitting in a room separate from everybody else. The reason why the conference topic is the conference topic is because we're all struggling with this issue. In listening to each other we're going to come back to each other with a proposal. What seems to be clearer and clearer to all of us is that we need perhaps to move away from the semantics of the word museum, and rather think about a set of standards (for want of a better word) that platforms can reflect. But at the same time, some of what's troubling me about what we're talking about is that letting this idea of the museum go altogether is very scary to me, because I think that in that case we're also letting go of an opportunity for consensus in the civic sphere. And what scares me a little about the specialisation of our various almost super-customised, super-regional, super-micro formulations is that we're going to forget how to talk in a civic, public sphere. So that's what I'm struggling with when I'm listening to everybody.

Kian Chow Kwok: Yes, you first and then you. Okay.

Zoran Eric: Zoran Eric from the Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade. I feel somehow that there is this idea of museum is becoming obsolete in a way. From our position, a museum built in 1965 and that is therefore approaching its fiftieth anniversary as a museum of contemporary art has been closed for seven years due to reconstruction. So this gap has created a strange atmosphere and we are now facing several artistic initiatives that are thematising the idea of the museum. One artist opened his own private museum under his nickname, the Zepter Museum, for example. Another artist is thematising the idea of childhood [Museum of

Childhood] and yet another is opening The RaBernard Blistèneit Museum (you know, the animal). So, is this just a coincidence, or does this artistic practice reflect the lack of the main museum that would be a hub for them? I'm just wondering, because we've talked a lot about whether we should watch what is happening in the art world, but are artists themselves watching what is happening in the museum and why the museum isn't fully operative?

Kian Chow Kwok: Thank you. Anne-Catherine, yes. Anne-Catherine [Robert-Hauglustaine] is Director General of ICOM.

Anne-Catherine Robert-Hauglustaine: Thank you. I think it's quite impossible for me not to answer this question, as I'm the General Director of the National Council of Museums. There are over 3,000 members in the association and more than 50,000 museums are concerned with it. I've been following your debate and I think it's very interesting. We've been discussing this topic with CIMAM and I would advise that we are definitely in a time when museums are changing. This is not new, it's just there's an acceleration now, lots of ideas are coming up and as an association that has a code of ethics I have to be, in a way, careful that the word museum will not change each year with new ideas. That would make no sense. The last definition of museum, according to our code of ethics at ICOM, was proposed in 2007. I would definitely suggest that with ICOM joining CIMAM and probably hiring a person who will address this issue as we work with UNESCO on a new normative instrument on the question of museums, now is probably the best time to do it. We will suggest new ideas to revise the definition, which as we know will take years. But we must also make sure that while some of the new ideas will definitely fit the word museum, some of the ideas you are discussing might not fit at all what we're doing. Which means it may be great work, but it's not museum work. What we also know is that the word museum is not a trademark, so everyone can use the word museum even if what they do bears no relation at all to museums. What can we do? That's why we're here, it's why we're trying to be careful not to mix ideas up. What people are doing should be discussed but not confused. So that would be my recommendation. The President and the Board of CIMAM are beginning to have a very tight schedule regarding these topics and I'm sure they'll be able to give you more information at the general assembly. Thank you.

Bartomeu Marí: Thank you Anne-Catherine. I just wanted to add that some individual members of CIMAM work at institutions that are not museums but are part of the ecosystem of contemporary art, and are extraordinarily important for the good health and the functioning of what we call contemporary art. The idea of museum or not museum is also very

relevant if we are to observe (and rewrite, if necessary) that code of ethics that makes the system or the ecosystem function as a web of institutions dedicated to public interest, whatever that is. Or perhaps we should say 'what we used to call the public interest'. We have to find new words to define what it is from now onwards.

To return also to the title of our 2014 session, 'Changes in the relationship between public interest and private resources' refers to one of the domains in which we are seeing more and more changes that we should address. So that's probably why tomorrow we shall return in a more direct and specific way to these issues.

Ute Meta Bauer: Okay. I just wanted to come back to the change in notions of museums as a preserve of art history, and I think we should also connect art back to culture. At our university we are currently carrying out research into the visualisation of cultural heritage versus cultural heritage, and we all discuss what that means. I think that what has come up here is really crucial; that there are regions where at this very moment it is impossible to gain access to certain cultural histories, yet they are still cultural histories, so where can they be preserved? On the other hand, I think we should also talk about ownership: who owns culture? Maybe it's about time to share what museums own more, and then their histories can also be rewritten in a different way. Luckily, museums contain artefacts that otherwise would have been lost. So it's not exactly either/or, but a question of how we can really offer more access to the same artefacts that may trigger the writing of different narratives. It doesn't matter if it's a nineteenth-century museum, a history museum or an art museum, they can all share their resources to really review history in a different way.

Antonia Alampi: For me, this raises interesting thoughts regarding the relationship between a museum, its collection, and who actually owns this collection. Talking again from the perspective of Egypt, where there are no contemporary art collections, what happens is that [the works of] most local artists are actually acquired elsewhere and exist in collections all over the world, but technically not in Egypt. There are no institutions such as museums large enough to ensure that these works can travel in parallel power relationships, so what happens is that these works leave the country and very rarely come back. As an institution, Beirut recently engaged with the Cadist Art Foundation that was quite experimental for us. The Cadist Art Foundation agreed on lending us a number of art works that we had selected from their collection, obviously setting up a dialogue, for a whole year. There are no Egyptian artists in their collection but there are a number of Lebanese artists, Palestinian artists, etc. We saw works by Akram Zaatari and

Walid Raad in Cairo that we had never seen before! So again, who owns these collections and how can museums actually set up different kinds of partnerships with smaller institutions? I guess that's a very pragmatic proposal, but can collections actually travel? Can we stop considering collections as being owned by cities, nations, etc.?

Q: [Inaudible]

Antonia Alampi: Yes, modern, not contemporary. Up to the sixties, mostly.

Kian Chow Kwok: Again I'm doing the very dangerous thing of trying to make a summary of these points. Reasons for having museums: consolidation, conversations, platforms, stability, continuity, museological heritage, being important as an institution type for all societies, visual culture as an asset to culture and to history, and a continuation of a platform whereby discussions and knowledge can converge and be centralised in museums. Reasons for not having museums (from the art world perspective): they are inadequate, they do not fully capture the ecology and the energies of art practices, they have some inherent characteristics which may not be conducive to art practices because of their tendency to monumentalise narrative and to look upon art works as treasures, and all this challenges the contemplation of art and art practices within the museum context. I think they are roughly that, so let's continue the discussion.

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: Lizz-Ann MacGregor from Sydney. Thanks. Maybe the topic for the next conference should be 'Who are museums for?' I'd like to bring Gabi back into the conversation because I was very interested in her critique, I guess, of the art gallery, which is obviously an institution that she feels has lost its relevance. I'd like to ask her whether she thinks it is possible for her to re-engage in any kind of meaningful way, or whether an institution in the particular situation that it sits in is impossible. My second question—or maybe it's more of a statement than a question—is around what I think is a very interesting contrast between the reaction to the first Johannesburg Biennale and the reaction to the second Johannesburg Biennale. I attended the first, and it obviously had a lot of issues and problems. A lot of us were a bit uncertain about the ethics of a biennale at that particular time and in that particular context, but it had a kind of relationship with its community that was very well received in many ways, even though aesthetically it may not have been the best biennale ever. Unfortunately the second one, as we know, led to its demise. So, interesting questions around an institutional relationship to its community, both in terms of the Johannesburg Art Gallery and in terms of the biennales. Gabi, I'd love you to just tell us a little bit

more about what you see as the role of institutions in South Africa, and in Africa generally.

Gabi Ngcobo: I don't know what the role of institutions in Africa or South Africa is. I think the role of institutions is ever-changing. If I speak about Johannesburg directly, I can mention the example of the building that we used to work in, August House. I think what is happening in Johannesburg now is something that I will call the 'coolwashing' of public spaces, which explains why the question that was posed at the biennales, especially the second biennale—who it was for—was a crucial question. It still is a crucial question but the answer is different now, because of the coolwashing that is taking place in the city. We exited the building because we were afraid of being part of the vacuum-cleaning of the area in which we were operating. Perhaps a year after that there was a very cool article about artists who were still working in August House, shortly after which they had to leave the building because it had been bought by gentrifiers. The sale didn't go through and the building now sits quite empty. The very last slide in my presentation is that picture of the corner of Kerk and Nugget streets with the elephant that has now been turned around. We don't know who did that. It was a very interesting coincidence. But still thinking through this elephant, it becomes a sign of the times, [a sign] that perhaps we need to look in a different direction.

As to the first and second biennales, although I missed both of them, the kind of exhibitions they were is very apparent from the catalogues. There is no centralised archive of the biennale, there is nowhere where you can go and learn more about it. All we have are these two books with pictures that I showed, but they don't really tell the whole story. Our story was really to also use the accidental monument of the elephant to speculate, to perhaps not look for the truth but formulate new questions. Yesterday a William Kentridge exhibition opened at the JAG, and when Kentridge shows at the JAG he's on resources to the JAG. Yet it's not the JAG that provides the resources—most of the resources come from the West. It's a show that has been displayed in the West, and that's why it's possible. I've been looking at images online and seeing the space that was grey and somewhat deserted now suddenly come to life, and the audience as well. This is also part of the 'coolwashing' of Johannesburg. When we had a space at August House we had a line from the manifesto by Angolan artist Nástio Mosquito which said 'Don't be cool, be relevant. And if you can be relevantly cool, good for you', which was a way of kind of responding the question of who it was for.

Maria Lind: Maria Lind, from Tensta Konsthall. I just have a footnote if I may, about what an institution might do. It's the philosopher John

Searle who writes about institutions in general, public institutions, including museums (and I'd like to think that he somehow could have had art museums and art institutions in mind), and that the purpose of an institution is to change power relationships.

Zeina Arida: Exactly. I was going to say that we hadn't heard and hadn't said the word power yet. I think it's very important, because a museum is always seen to be—or is—a powerful institution. I think maybe we need to discuss this in relation to art centres. I also wanted to go back to what Anne-Catherine was saying about the definition of a museum. Actually, two weeks ago a curator called Nat Muller invited me to a panel in which she defined the museum as a time capsule. I quite agree with that definition and in that sense, what is the difference between the Arab Image Foundation and a museum, if it's not the power? The Arab Image Foundation has a huge public and lots of exposure. It diffuses the work in very different ways. Actually it doesn't have a public space itself. I think we had maybe forty different exhibitions touring the world.

Salwa Mikdadi: I have a question for Zeina. As a new museum that will open soon, what are your plans in relation to the informal art institutions in Beirut?

Zeina Arida: I come from where I come from. I mean, when I started discussing with the Sursock Museum about the potential position, I began to hear about all the other museum projects. We need to agree about what we need from museums. Coming as I do from the Arab Image Foundation and from this scene, I think the museum has to find ways of keeping its framework very open so that it can interact with different artists, different initiatives. Of course, it also to do things that every museum does, have different departments, serve [the public], build knowledge, promote education on art, etc. Yet I'm also trying to see how we can be a very open museum and a place where different actors on the Lebanese scene, for instance, can discuss and exchange views, rather than each of us being on our own.

Suha Shoman: Maybe the solution would be what I was just told about MoMA and PS1, which was a kind of initiative to encourage younger artists. Could you tell us about PS1 and what you think about these issues?

Kian Chow Kwok: But let me say something first. Again, I invite you all to share your experiences, and if you feel more comfortable speaking in another language there will always be people in the room who can translate. Please share with us. Now we have a question there, and then Patricia. Please.

Serena Iervolino: My name is Serena Iervolino and I'm a lecturer here at UCL, where I work on the MA on Museum and Gallery Practice. I've been hearing you talking about the relevance of museums

here, and broadly all over the world. One comment that I wanted to make is that I really felt there was a polarisation in the way we were discussing why we have museums and why they are relevant. We were also talking about grass-roots organisations and other sorts of art practices that might be initiated by other sorts of institutions. As a museologist who studies museum changes, and how they might become more relevant for different kinds of publics (in the plural, of course), I think there is a point we may be missing, which is how the two initiatives could come together. The point raised by Gabi during her presentation was how a museum could work in a participatory way, and how we can move away from the curatorial tycoons. I think there is a possibility of production there in the way in which traditional Western-based curatorial practice might be changed through productive engagement and collaborations with other actors. I think this also probably links back to the idea of power. Who holds the power to actually curate culture? Who is in charge of making decisions? And how can we change the ways in which decisions are made? The second point I wanted to make is related to the idea of how the heritage of criticality can become a part of professionalisation or professional training. And I think this is very much what we're trying to do here, training museum professionals not just in traditional, standard Western-European practices but also thinking about curating, presenting, displaying and preserving heritage in different ways to those in which we were trained. We mustn't forget where we come from — most of us trained here in curatorial practice, and I think this is always a challenge with students.

Kian Chow Kwok: I would just like to say that, going by our discussion here, it is no longer a question of Western and non-Western. We all share the same challenges, and it is important to be inspired by local practices all over the world. Judging by the totality of efforts we put in, we may continue to find museum work challenging. So this is exactly the kind of forum in which to share such challenges, and it's great that we have people from all over the world to really discuss all this. Patricia, who is Secretary of CIMAM.

Patricia Sloane: I would like to comment on this notion of power. Basically, when we're talking about public, the notion of public is necessarily political. I work in the National University in Mexico, which is a very important point for Mexican politics, a place where politics is made, and our museum as such is not a point of display of art, it's a point of political discourse. I think that this notion of what a museum is serving within its own context has an enormous amount of interplay between our publics and the people who are creating the contents of the museum. So it's not about having a collection or

having a programme with a given number of exhibitions a year; it's the notion itself of the exchange with the public that has political, social and economic undertones. The next step is that in Latin America at least there was a moment when we were not talking to each other as a region. The different Latin American countries were on their own specific agendas, depending on the government system that was in power at the time, whether it be a dictatorship or a democracy. And now that things have levelled out and we have a discourse in common, we are talking to each other and we are generating programmes together amongst the museums. So in that sense, the museum becomes a point of political discourse, and its publics are part of that discourse. I just wanted to bring this into the discussion.

Laura Barlow: I'm Laura, I'm working at Mathaf in Doha. I have a comment and an observation in response to Serena's remarks just a moment ago. And also, within the discussion that we've had so far, which is to think about how the museum collaborates with smaller arts spaces across the globe, and what the responsibility of the museum is in relation to those practices. I wanted to point out the importance of thinking of the responsibility of the museum in a context where maybe there are no independent institutions working at those levels. Perhaps something can be said about Doha in particular, which is what makes me ask you to consider that perspective. How does the museum then not necessarily take on the activities of smaller arts organisations? How do you reconcile all types of activities across a city when the landscape is as it is here?

Kian Chow Kwok: I suppose, you know, it is good for us to think about what would be a kind of reasonable ecology when there are major museums, art spaces and so on. Again, this is an opportunity for us to share the kind of different ecologies we see in different places. But it's true that the whole discussion today has been on how museums would serve art in some ways and to a certain extent, but would not serve art in other ways. This is very much the spirit of the discussion, and we are all looking at this with eyes wide open. The point here is how museums can do more and support art practice further. Now, one, two, three questions. I have seven minutes, and then four, five... two more! [Laughter]. Okay, I'll start with you.

Judith Nesbitt: Hello, I'm Judith Nesbitt from Tate Gallery and I just wanted to say that I think partnership is increasingly a mode of practice for institutions, museums large and small, and it's never an easy way of doing anything. There is no formula for partnership — every relationship has to be worked out and established on terms of trust and openness. But I wanted to give two concrete

examples of the way in which, as a national institution, we are working across the United Kingdom. One is the Plus Tate organisation, which currently has eighteen visual arts organisations right across the UK and which is now being increased to up to thirty partners. It was created in 2009 as a response to the development of new institutions across the UK who could benefit from the support that Tate could offer through advocacy or other ways, but also in recognition that we are part of a visual arts ecology and, as a national organisation, we are also dependent on the strength of those galleries in their own cities. So, that's a forum for exchange of ideas and practice, and it's working well. The other project that my colleague Frances Morris has been very much involved in is the Artist Rooms Collection, which is actually jointly owned by the Tate and the National Galleries of Scotland. It's a dispersed collection, which has toured very remarkably and successfully to hundreds of venues, small, medium, large, right across the country. So those are two concrete examples which we are committed to developing.

Q: I would like to come back to the point of the power of the museum, because we always speak of power being a problem but I think that for the museum to have this power is most important, because only this power gives us the chance to protect collections. We have problems everywhere to protect collections, to complete them and to save artistic material. For me, this is the basis of the museum, while its role and the way it can cooperate with other institutions are secondary. How to work with the collection, and participate on initiatives with artists, audiences, and so on. The two points are of course interconnected, but museums need power to protect their collections, to protect the art works.

Michelle Wong: My name is Michelle Wong and I work in Hong Kong at Asia Art Archive, a non-profit, independent organisation whose mission is to facilitate art historical research around recent art in Asia. We are based in Hong Kong, and our public interface there is actually a library, that's open to the public, free of charge, six days a week. I would like to speak, from practice, of our collaboration with the Hong Kong Museum of Art on a project called the Hong Kong Art History Research Project. The idea is to create a set of research tools to facilitate art historical research by following multiple lines of enquiry. From my practice I see that this is actually a very concrete way of collaborating, perhaps not in the form of exhibitions or of delivering complete narratives, that has a certain authority, but being together to mind the different archives and the materials that are otherwise invisible. Through this collaboration with the Hong Kong MA, they've actually opened up parts of their archives. We're exploring together, and the tools

that we're delivering include oral interviews with practitioners who are in their eighties and nineties, who were active in the sixties and seventies. Some of them have shared their personal archives with us, including archival material from the museum as well, and with digital technology we can actually scan these documents. So this is in fact changing the politics and economics of doing art history, of the circulation of materials. I'd like to think that this is one of the ways that museums and smaller organisations can work together and move forward together.

Kian Chow Kwok: Excellent, yes. This is an example of a collaborative approach.

Reema Fada: There's something that's in the back of my mind that has been coming constantly out of this discussion, which is how can museums really retain their criticality, their civic engagement? How do they start to really create a point of friction and really call on that political motivation of civic engagement? Because I think the level of discomfort that we all sense from museums and museum practices is that there's a sedentary kind of quality in that aspect of engagement with that art which, in its own instances, really comes out of criticality and a sense of urgency.

Mayssa Fattouh: Can I just add something to that? Sorry to jump in, but my question is can one speak of political discourse from a position of power? When you're sitting in a position of power and you validate and own culture, how can you then instigate political discourse?

Kian Chow Kwok: We're running out of time, but please, let's agree to stop at 4.05, which means we have five more minutes. Is that fine with everyone? Now, we have several questions, so if you can make it short that will be appreciated. Thanks.

Amanda Coulson: I'm Amanda Coulson from the National Art Gallery of The Bahamas. When everyone keeps talking about all this power we have in creating identity, it sort of makes me laugh a little bit because we're a very young institution and obviously it's a very big burden we have. One of the things that we try to do in particular is have political discourse, support off-spaces. We work very closely with a lot of the artist-run spaces in The Bahamas, and to me that is a very normal thing to do. I lived in Germany for ten years before I moved back home (I am Bahamian), and I didn't realise that when I had people visiting that was an extremely unusual thing to do in the Caribbean. We have the problem where government institutions are sedentary. All these words are being used — sedentary, power.

I think it's not that hard for an institution to create spaces. We create spaces which we allow others to enter and engage with our audience. I think also that the idea of having power as a positive

thing can also be good, because it allows you to sanction things and to help people, not with funding (because we have none) but just in lending the platform of your actual space, of your brand. And that's a way that an institution can really support young projects that are more flexible and allow them to continue, and to help them to promote themselves. That's all I have to say.

Salwa Mikdadi: I just wanted to say very quickly that a few years ago I was engaged in a research project for a museum in Bethlehem and, after extensive research among the community, we discovered that the younger generation (aged twenty-five and under) were interested in a non-object museum, in the museum more as a kind of experience, with rotating exhibitions of contemporary art related to many of the issues that were of concern to them. I just wanted to share that with the person who spoke earlier of museums without objects. For security purposes, as Reema said, that's the best solution for Palestinian museums.

Kian Chow Kwok: We really must end, but as a special offer, you'll have the last say. [Laughter]

Jeremy Lewison: I'm Jeremy Lewison. I'm an independent curator, although at one point I worked at the Tate, and I sit on the advisory committee of the Cadist Foundation. I think this issue of museums' power is more complex than we're saying, because power resides in a museum for all sorts of different reasons. There's the power of the funder, whether it's government or private. There's the power of the museum to be able to present history, but also the power of the museum to be able to manipulate history. Museums are under political pressure to present history in particular ways — currently diversity is the political pressure, but it wasn't always that way. But the real power in the museum lies in the art. It's the artists who really have power, because without art there would be no museum. And somehow, I think, museums need to remember that they don't have power unless it comes from the art. They must also take into account the funding and the political circumstances under which they work. So it's too simple just to say museums have power. It's much more diverse and difficult than that.

Kian Chow Kwok: Thank you. I think that's a very nice positive note on which to end the discussion. We are now going to an exhibition opening. Thank you everyone. Thank you for all your contributions. And thanks too to the panel. [Applause]

---

Tuesday  
11 November  
2014

# Private to Public, Public to Private: What Are the New Professional Practices?

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: If we could get started, please. We've got another fantastic line-up for today. For those of you who don't know me, I'm Liz Ann MacGregor, I'm Director of the Museum of Contemporary Art Australia, located in Sydney, and I am Scottish (just in case you're wondering about my accent, which is definitely not Australian). Anyway, we've had a fantastically stimulating couple of days, I'm sure you'll agree. We've gone through some very thought-provoking presentations, and it was incredible yesterday to be able to focus on the situation within this region, and to hear some of the stories that the key protagonists here had to tell us. I'm particularly thinking back to the wonderful opening presentation by Hito [Hito Steyerl] about the secret museum, and this idea of the free port has kind of been percolating in the back of my mind. I'm wondering if the role of museums is to free art works from these dreadful prisons! Because today we're going to revert back to a discussion that Olav [Velthuis] began on our opening day around the statistics of the art world, the boom in the art world, the question of moral panic around the boom in the art world, and how that affects museums and our

ability to buy works of art. Some museums of course, like my own, don't engage with the secondary market and, as a matter of policy, we only buy directly from artists and their primary dealers. However, it is inevitable that museums will intersect with the market, which is why I think today's keynote is so interesting and important for us.

Luiz Augusto Teixeira de Freitas is a lawyer and a passionate art collector. He has some wonderful collections, one of which he has already deposited at a public-private partnership, the Fundação Serralves in Porto. He is Brazilian but he lives between London and Lisbon, and he's involved with a number of institutions which go across the spectrum: from large, such as the Tate, to small and more engaged within his own artistic community, like Chisenhale [London] and Artists Space in New York. He therefore, has I think, an extraordinary perspective on the art world, and he's going to talk to us today about the question of the market, and indeed the lack of regulation and the impact that that has. Please join me in welcoming Luiz Augusto Teixeira de Freitas. Thank you. [Applause]

---

## Keynote

# Luiz Augusto Teixeira de Freitas

*Biography:* Luiz Augusto Teixeira de Freitas is a Brazilian art collector, resident in London and in Lisbon. He is a founding member of the law firm Teixeira de Freitas Rodrigues e Associados since 1993 and partner of the consultancy group, ON Corporate International, with activities in Portugal and African Portuguese-speaking countries. In the past ten years he has formed an extensive collection of art, its uniqueness lying mainly in the strength and consistency of its approach: focusing on contemporary art of the last two decades, with a special attention to emerging artists. The art works in the collection address issues that refer to architecture, construction, de-construction and edification in the most various media. There is also a group of art works by historical artists who were active in the sixties and seventies, whose works act

as historical matrices to a number of issues and key concepts in the collection. Luiz Augusto Teixeira de Freitas is also the owner of the Coleção de Desenhos da Madeira, which is deposited at Fundação Serralves in Porto, Portugal, and has created a collection of artists' books. Teixeira de Freitas is a member of the Middle East and North African Acquisition Committee [MENNAC] at the Tate, a founding patron of the Reina Sofía Museum Foundation, a member of the Director's Circle of Chisenhale Gallery, a patron of the Kunsthalle Lissabon and a friend of Artists Space in New York.

Well, good morning, and thank you very much Bartomeu, and CÍMAM, for this very kind invitation to participate in this conference for the first time. And especially for the opportunity of talking about this very sensitive topic of regulation versus non-regulation of the art market.

Before anything else, I need to offer an explanation for having chosen only two single images to illustrate my presentation. I think this is also an interesting introduction story.

Slide. The first one is an image of an art work which, for me, is the most iconic in my collection, that translates very well the spirit of the issues I'm going to address today—the *Condensation Cube* by Hans Haacke, which I'm sure is familiar to you all. This work was acquired approximately eight years ago after a long long negotiation with Andrée Sfeir-Semler from Beirut and Hamburg, because I think (I'm not a hundred per cent sure) that I'm the only private collector who owns this work, which is an edition; all the other *Condensation Cubes* are in public institutions. So it was a big commitment for Andrée to sell the work to me, and it was a big commitment for me as a collector to be a depository of this work. At that time I already had some knowledge about Hans Haacke's work, his role as one of the leading figures of the institution of critique. However, at the moment of the purchase I wasn't aware that I would need to have a ceremony to close the deal, with the presence of the artist, where I would have to sign the famous and now historic Siegelaub's The Artist's Reserved Rights Transfer and Sale Agreement which, among other stipulations, would give the artist the right to receive 15% of any increase in value of the work, on any future transfer of ownership, and the right of veto any time the work is to be exhibited in public spaces. We had a beautiful ceremony in London, at a restaurant, in the presence of Hans Haacke and his wife, his dealer André Steimler, and my witness João Fernandes, today the director of Reina Sofía, along with a few other friends we had invited. Since then the work has been exhibited in shows all over the world, in museums, always with the previous consent of the artist in writing, both for the shows and for the publications. I understand that those images and this story are important as a background for what will follow. And it's also funny that only once I displayed my collection at a biennial in the Canary Islands, and because it was an exhibition of my own collection I showed the work and completely forgot to tell Hans

Haacke, and he wrote to me; I thought he was joking but he was quite upset that I had not asked for his consent to show the work at the biennial.

Slide. This is the actual document, The Artist's Reserved Rights Transfer and Sale Agreement, the one I signed with Hans Haacke. By the way, he is the only artist today who still uses this contract. I think Daniel Buren for some time used this kind of agreement, but I've been talking to some of the galleries who represent him and he's no longer using it. I'm not absolutely, one hundred per cent sure, but I'm quite sure that Hans Haacke is the only one who continues to use this contract.

So, first of all I would like to briefly explain the reason why this issue of regulation versus self-regulation of the art market has become a concern for me. It is also important to say that I'm not an academic in this field. Being a tax lawyer by profession and a collector of contemporary art for almost fifteen years now, my limited knowledge in this area comes from the experience acquired by living with art during this period. Before anything else, therefore, I am an amateur in these matters and a collector who has a strong passion for art. Selfishly speaking, I would not be so concerned with this issue if I were sure that the market would only have a perilous effect on certain artists who are explicitly market-oriented, because I never had any interest in those anyway.

Unfortunately, this is not the reality and it has become impossible to make this distinction. The market is such that many artists who are not necessarily interested in money, fame and power are dragged into this whirlpool. More often than not, even the most serious of artists are contaminated by the system due to the blurred boundaries of the power structure. Some statistics illustrate well the present situation, and are also important as a background for this conversation. Prices of contemporary art have dramatically increased in the last ten, fifteen years. According to the art market report of TEFAF, in 2013 the global art market had an estimated turnover of more than 47 billion euros. This figure has been mentioned previously at this conference. Online sales in the same period reached 2.5 billion, with an increase of 25% as regards the previous year. This market alone is expected to reach 10 billion in 2020. The postwar and contemporary sector reached the historical peak of almost 5 billion, 4.9 billion in auction sales alone the same year. In 2013, approximately 30 million

American individuals were millionaires (I mention America because it's by far the largest market for art), and it is estimated that 600,000 of them, only 2%, collect art. So there's a lot of potential there!

Now let's see how these numbers are relevant in comparison with figures in other markets. And this again is important for me to be able to make this comparison between regulated markets and deregulated markets. The spirits industry, globally, which is strictly regulated, had a turnover of 82 billion euros that same year, so the [volume] of the spirits industry was only approximately 50% or 60% greater than that of the art market. The US military budget in 2013 was approximately 500 billion euros; the art market represented 10% of that amount. The total turnover of the luxury goods market (jewellery, watches, cosmetics, etc.) in 2012 amounted to approximately 200 billion euros, only four times the turnover of the art market. So the exponential increase in importance of the art market during the last fifteen years has been of much concern to me. The situation has changed a lot in this period, and the figures reflecting those changes were clearly shown by Olav Velthuis in his presentation two days ago. The number of millionaires has dramatically increased in the last two decades, and with it, thousands of new collectors are attracted to the market every year. There is an incredible liquidity in the world, and those at the top of the pyramid simply do not know where to put their money. Some of them found art. Social prestige and power have always seduced new collectors, and now there is even a possibility of an asset-class investment. Why not? It's interesting to see that except for the monetary volume involved, the story is still the same. For instance, back in 1969, at the Art Workers' Coalition Open Hearing, the following statement was made: 'Artworks are subject to price speculation and manipulation by profiteering galleries and commercial middlemen who reduce art to objects of conspicuous consumption and artists to producers of luxury commodities, servants of the wealthy and toadies of the upper middle-class elite, whose livelihood depends on their capacity to provide for the entertainment of isolated rich persons. Rich persons who control museums as well as other legitimate communicative agencies and who are waging war in Vietnam, and calling the cops at Columbia, and justifying their slaughter by their precious conscious support of art.'

To be very honest, I do not like what I see now, in 2014. Some people tell me I'm a nostalgic and a romantic about art, and that I only look at the past. This may be true, but still I do not like what I see, and if I could in some way be able to alert people, especially young collectors, as to what is really important and to convince a few of them of it,

I would be satisfied. And for me, what is really important is the art itself and its capacity to change my life. That is the true value of an art work, independently of any validation given either by museums, galleries or curators.

So what I want to discuss now, with a special focus on the deontological codes for museums, museum directors, employees and curators, is the complete lack of a regulatory framework in the art market. Just as a comparison, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that even the markets of online gambling and online pornography are more regulated, albeit poorly, than the art market. These industries have always looked to base their operations in typical tax havens, known for allowing the establishment of any business under a very light regulation. Not even that exists in the art market. Simply, no regulation. The only other totally unregulated markets we could find on the road today are illegal. I'm talking about drugs, traffic of weapons, traffic of persons, traffic of human organs. So we are in good company! [Laughter]

A New York collector and financier said in a recent interview 'The art world feels like the private equity market of the eighties and the hedge funds of the nineties.' The outcome of that was not very positive, as we have seen in the last five or six years.

No rules whatsoever regulate the various relationships and consequent exchange of information among the various operators of the market. No specific rules regulate the auction houses, no specific rules regulate the role of the dealer, no specific rules regulate the sale of works to museums. No rules at all regulate the role of collectors as patrons of museums, no specific rules regulate dealers as financiers of museum shows. Considering the staggering sums involved today, it could be argued that on one hand, the art market—and art itself—is very healthy, but it could also be argued that the complete lack of rules in this environment makes the art world a propitious and attractive place for less scrupulous people. I have no doubt that an important share of the mentioned 50 billion euros is represented by people and their money looking for a safe haven in an economy without regulation. It's very simple: if you have a very strict regulated market you look for those that are less regulated, at least that's what the people who are looking for loopholes do, people and money who have no interest whatsoever in art—in other words, they are only interested in art as a commodity. One thing that was not mentioned in Hito's inspiring presentation about the secret museums of Geneva, Singapore and, more recently, the brand new one in Luxemburg, is the identity of the owners of those works of art that will never be shown to the public. It is possible to guess that a great part of these collection belong to art funds,

and another part simply belongs to individuals who have invested with non-declared funds in their country of origin, among other worse—much worse—illegalities. Funnily enough, no banks in Europe today would accept a single euro, a single deposit, from a European resident without a full disclosure that those funds have been in his country of residence. However, the same rules do not apply for the secret museums, which are depositories of billions of euros in works of art. Of course, one could always argue that everybody should be considered honest unless proven the contrary, but if this is so, why are all other activities completely regulated and only the art market remains unregulated?

To the best of my knowledge, the only existing laws in force regulating the art market are the *Droit de Suite* [resale royalty right] in some European countries such as the UK, a law that gives artists the right to receive a percentage of any resale of their works. Practice has shown that this law has been very difficult to enforce. The other one is the Pricing Law that has existed for decades in New York and which requires items for sale in any business to have a price tag clearly displayed. There is no exception in the law for art; nevertheless, dealers totally disregard the law and it's almost impossible to find one single gallery that complies with this rule—some of them will simply say 'it's very tacky to put a price tag on an art work'. [Laughter]

I will now give you some examples of operations that have always been—and continue to be—common practice in the art market, and probably with the monies now involved it's possible to speculate that they have become even more routine. It's important to highlight that these very same operations in other markets would all be considered illegal and, in some cases, even a crime.

**Price manipulation:** dealers freely manipulate the prices of artists in whom they have a vested interest; they bid at auctions on artists they represent, thus fictitiously maintaining the price of their work. This kind of procedure would be heavily regulated in the stock market, for example, and is simply not regulated in the art market. In the secondary market nothing prevents a dealer either from presenting himself as an agent to hide his role as the actual buyer and reseller of the art work just to make a higher commission. A few disputes on this subject have reached the courts and are presently pending decision.

**Art consultancy:** the art consultancy profession lacks any regulation whatsoever. Some consultants charge fees to collectors, and at the same time freely receive commissions from galleries and do not have any obligation to disclose that practice to the collector. There is no regulation with

respect to the qualification of these individuals—anyone can decide to be an art consultant.

**Insider trading:** operating with privileged information is a very sensible matter that really should be regulated. Normal and acceptable practices in the art market would mean long jail time in other businesses. For example, if you have information of a future show by a given artist scheduled to take place in a certain important institution, nothing prevents you from buying works by that artist before the information becomes available to the public. And this information is quite easy to obtain.

Another example, in which I even include myself, is the information obtained at the meetings of acquisition committees of certain important European museums. In one minute we are informed and decide on those acquisitions, together with the curators, and once the meeting is over, nothing prevents us from running to the gallery which represents those artists and buying the work before the information becomes of public knowledge. And obviously, prices are adjusted accordingly after the artist has been given this exposure. The same practice would be harshly punished, for example, in the stock market.

A few years ago, a famous American TV host was sentenced to five months imprisonment in addition to a two-year period of supervised release just because she benefitted from a tip on a 50 thousand USD sale of shares. On top of that, she was condemned to pay a fine of three times the amount of the benefit and received a five-year ban from serving as director of any company.

**Price fixing:** if an artist is represented by three or four different dealers it's quite normal for the dealers to decide that the work should be sold for a minimum given price. This is an illegal anti-trust behaviour that is completely overruled in the art market.

**Auction houses:** many common practices of auction houses are without any doubt, and to say the least, very obscure.

**Chandelier bidding:** a completely fictitious bidding to falsely increase the price of the art works. The auctioneer, with the excuse of protecting the reserved price and in the best interests of the seller, simply creates a theatre in which he is the only actor, by pretending to spot bids in the room. This is true—it's amazing! This is a common practice of auction houses and should be completely abolished.

**Third-party guarantees:** the third-party guarantee is a contract between the dealer—the auction house—and the financier, according to which the auction house, with the backing of the financier, guarantees to pay a certain price to the seller of the work. If the final bid exceeds the guarantee, the auction house splits the amount with

the financier. This means that it is in the best interests of the financier to bid without the real intention to buy the work, but just to falsely increase its price. Whenever the financier wins the bid for a specific work which he doesn't want (though this may happen) the actual sale price made available to the public is not the real price, because he's entitled to a financing-fee discount which is deducted from the actual winning bid price. On top of that, these guarantors and the auction house are disrupting the transparency of the auction because the public does not know, in the first place, that there is someone operating behind the curtains and that the guarantors' only interest is to bid up the price.

Museums: the market controls today the world of contemporary art. In the past, museums used to validate the works of art that only afterwards would circulate in the market. This has changed. Today, private collectors, and sometimes the curators who assist them, have created a new situation for the museum. As recently mentioned in an interview by João Fernandes, Director of Museo Reina Sofía, museums are accepting the return of the princes. Private collectors with their own tastes are becoming more and more visible in museum collections. This relevant change—or rather, return—raises various questions that should be addressed here and put up for debate.

The financing of museums in Europe, which in the past was totally guaranteed by the state, is now shared with the private sector. The dilemma is how to accept private funds and, at the same time, preserve independence, a programme that should have as its primary purpose the public interest. Of course, companies and private collectors always expect some return on their 'invested' money, and in the case of Europe this is even more relevant when tax incentives are not as favourable to patrons as they are in the US. There, this reward is straightforward: a huge tax break. It is only natural that in Europe, private collectors and companies are always expecting their own returns, which do not only come from tax breaks.

I've just read a very interesting article by J. J. Charlesworth in the current issue of *Art Review* addressing this and other very relevant matters. He claims that commercial galleries behave increasingly like public institutions, hiring curators to produce museum shows. There is definitely an increase in traffic between the public and the private sectors. I did not decide on any names in this presentation but some cases have been widely covered by the press, so I don't think that I'll be committing any indiscretion. In fact, some of these examples are quite important for this discussion of regulation versus self-regulation. Very recently, the Director of MOCA LA for twenty-two years stepped down, and less than one year later accepted the

position of Partner and Director of the new Hauser Wirth & Schimmel Gallery in Los Angeles. According to Wirth himself, the space (and this is the press release of the gallery, published on its website) would be a commercial gallery but also 'a dynamic, multi-disciplinary arts center', with 'innovative exhibitions, museum-caliber amenities, and a robust schedule of public programs that contextualize the art on view'. Again, this practice, if it had happened in the financial sector—banking or securities—would be subject in any country to very strict regulations, imposing on the person leaving the public sector at least a quarantine before joining the private sector, and also very tough secrecy rules concerning the exchange of information. The director himself clearly mentioned that he would simply continue the programme that he was unable to implement at MOCA in the gallery, so he openly discussed the issue. That's not his problem; it's the problem of the non-regulation. He's not even aware of how dangerous this is, that he's mixing the public and the private, information that he had gathered in a position that was supposed to be public.

And then we return to the theme of this discussion, how can we preserve the independence of public institutions when they are increasingly contaminated by the interference of the new princes and even of galleries? Instead of drawing any conclusion to this sensitive topic, I would prefer to raise several questions addressing the growing interference of collectors and galleries in public institutions. Today, temporary exhibitions in the most important museums and public institutions all over the world are made possible with the support of corporations, individuals and commercial galleries. Is this common practice transparent? Do museums and public institutions seriously scrutinise the origin of the funds received from patrons? Do the individuals and corporations who support these shows have privileged access to the information about them? Is there any law that prevents those individuals directly or indirectly involved in the show from buying works from that given artist before the information about the show is made available to the public? Since a Richter retrospective was announced and finished a couple of years ago, there has been around a 50% increase in his prices. The same could be said for Boetti [Alighiero e Boetti], and even more for Cildo Meireles. If public institutions accept funding from commercial galleries, isn't there a risk that they could begin to manipulate the programmes of these institutions? It has become common practice in the most important museums to have acquisition committees made up of individuals, some of them directly or indirectly related with the market. Those individuals take part in important meetings, where decisions are made to acquire works for the museum collections. Is there

anything that prevents those patrons from using their privileged information and buying in advance works by these same artists before the information is made available to the public? Museums these days accept donations from patrons of works by very young and promising artists with the excuse that (and this is a complete paradox for me) if they do not buy quickly, prices are going up so fast that in a few years they would not be able to buy such works. What are the interests of the patrons in making such donations of works by very young, promising artists? Is it only love for the art and admiration for that public institution? Would it not be reasonable to accept the idea that these donations may affect the price of those artists, considering that by entering an important public collection their work is being validated by the institution?

Curators and directors of public institutions move freely from their public positions to the private sector, as I mentioned previously, mainly to commercial galleries. Is it unreasonable to suppose that those people retain private and relevant information that could affect the market? Many other questions linked to the relationship of curators, collectors and galleries with public institutions that in my opinion may affect the transparency of the public institutions could be raised. As posed in the introduction to the programme of this conference, the colossal overflow of capital that has inundated the art market in the last fifteen years requires we pay urgent attention to these questions. It's definitely time to address with greater rigour the issue of regulation of the art market. If this is still far from happening in the near future, public institutions should at least start reviewing these questions and eventually adapting their internal rules to address these issues. For me, transparency is the key. Going back to the beginning of this presentation, I return to Hans Haacke and it would be interesting to imagine a utopian situation in which the sale agreement created by Siegelauub would have been widely adopted by artists all over the world. If this had happened, would we be living today in a different art world? I do not know, but we would certainly be living in one in which art itself would still be the primary concern.

With respect to this art work, the image of the Hans Haacke, I have it installed in my living room and I look at it every morning when I wake up—it's at the end of the corridor and it's the first thing I look at when I step outside my bedroom. It changes every day, depending on the temperature, on the light, on the number of people who were in the room the night before. It's always there, in different ways but it's always there, just as we are always here. The difference—and this is what I'm looking for when I'm collecting—is that this work I'm sure will still be here for everyone to see when I'm not. This is what is

important I think in collecting, that we are depositories. I look for works that go further, that go beyond my very short time here. And it's a privilege to be a depository of this work that will remain after my short life in this world. I think that people should look more, when they are collecting art, rather than any other thing. Thank you very much. [Applause]

---

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: Wow! What a start to the day, what an incredible articulation of the very issue at the heart of this conference. Really a lot to think about, particularly the beginning of your presentation, Luiz Augusto, when you talk about the potential for artists to take back, that topic we were discussing yesterday which is power. If artists could actually enforce those kinds of agreements we would indeed be living in a very different world and having a different relationship with them. I think that's a very strong call to action and I'd like to open up to the floor and ask you if you have any questions.

---

## Questions and Answers

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: We have one right here. The lady in blue.

Lian The: Hello, good morning. I'm Lian The from the Netherlands. A few comments and one question. I feel perhaps that our world is being portrayed a little unfairly because in Holland we have ministers who move to private companies immediately they leave public service, so that's not, I think, unique to the art world. I also sense in your story a lot of parallels to real estate. I think that's partly regulated, but still has a lot of the issues that I think you mentioned. My question would be, what type of regulation would you actually be looking for? Because I always had the feeling that regulation in the financial sector, especially with insider trading, is to protect the interests of stockholders, of shareholders, so which interests precisely would be protected here? And would it be correct to say also that the regulation that is put in place in the financial sector has been showing us in the last years that it's still no replacement for integrity, which I think is maybe the key issue here for all players involved?

Luiz Augusto Teixeira de Freitas: Well, I wouldn't dare myself to be the person who would dictate. This is a call for a debate, for a very open debate on regulation and self-regulation. Of course, I pick up examples, but I think the main thing, as I mentioned, is that we all expect there to be serious

people, each in their own business or activities. In spite of that, all activities are regulated so I simply do not understand why the art market should have this exception of not being regulated. I'm not saying that there are not many many curators, many museum directors, many galleries and collectors who are very serious people. You say, who would this affect? This would affect the public in general. When I go to a gallery—and I'm not talking about myself, I don't need a regulation because after fifteen years I think I know a little about how the market operates—I do my research. But most people are not 'professionals' like I am, I mean they don't know the serious people, the serious institutions, the serious galleries, and they may end up being affected by the market. So, broadly speaking, the regulation is necessary for the public in general, for young collectors who are beginning to collect and are very naïve. When you say minority shareholders yes, minority shareholders are the public in general. I'm not talking about the shareholders who own a very important percentage in a company—although they need protection too, these are very well advised by their lawyers and, based on the law, they will protect their interests. But the public, the very very small shareholders, need protection, as I think that anybody who operates in the market does. When I go to an auction house I'm completely naïve, I'm completely new, how can I go there without knowing that there's a guy auctioning fictitiously, finding people who don't exist in the room? It's ridiculous! If there was a regulation, this would be completely banned and eradicated. So, I think the regulation is definitely necessary, irrespective of the serious people who exist in any industry, including the art market.

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: Over there?

Q: Yes. I think it would be nice to think a bit further about what the implications would be of regulation, especially when it comes to insider trading, because I guess that's where the differences are greater. But I don't think for the rest your picture of the market being completely unregulated is fair. I mean there are many general laws; you mentioned one, the Truth-in-Pricing act in New York, which is not in force, but of course other laws, like anti-trust laws are—think of the big lawsuit against Sotheby's and Christie's about their collusion in the late nineties, which almost brought down Sotheby's completely, almost made it go bankrupt. So there are general laws being enforced, and the number of lawsuits in general in the art market that both auction houses and art dealers are involved with has been rising spectacularly over the last decade. But not with the insider trading, so that's really interesting. It's also, by the way, the area in which the art market is really tiny compared to the financial markets. I mean the daily turnover on international currency markets is

many many many times more than the annual turnover on the art market, but let's say we would want to have insider trading laws in the art market. It would be interesting to consider what this means. I think basically it would mean that conferences like this would be absolutely impossible, because it would mean that as a museum you can only disclose information about an exhibition programme in the far future the very moment you make a press release about it and communicate it to the entire public, and until then you cannot communicate it to anybody outside your organisation. So I think what is interesting about the possibility of insider trading is that it is profoundly against the nature of how the art market—and the art world more broadly—functions. I think that deep down, the art world is a market or a world of communications that works by virtue of people permanently communicating in many different ways to each other, and that is exactly what insider trading would make impossible. So it would be interesting to think about the consequences. It would not just be that museum people can no longer talk to market people about what they're doing, but they can no longer talk to anybody about their future exhibition programmes, because that is all insider trading, that is all disclosing information to the non-public, to a non-general audience. So I would be curious to hear your thoughts about the practical implication of insider trading laws being implemented.

Luiz Augusto Teixeira de Freitas: Well, I'm sure it's an extremely complex issue; I'm just drawing attention to the situation. But if you start to give this kind of excuses just to avoid thinking about the need for regulation, then it's simply that you don't want this market to be affected. It's a market, it's real, it's 50 billion dollars, so it has to be addressed. Your same arguments could perhaps have been used forty or fifty years ago, when the stock market and securities began to be regulated in the US and then in other parts of the world. They could have given the same excuse as you're giving—'Well, how are you going to move information now? How are you going to talk to investors, to the people who want to finance my company? This will be impossible to manage and we'll end up without funds. We won't be able to do the IPOs'. I don't know what the system should be, I'm not the one... many people need to think how to regulate but there definitely should be a way. It must be regulated. We can't just say that as we need to talk to each other, otherwise it would all collapse, we don't need to regulate at all—'Well you see, the drug market in Mexico, you have to be tough on it, but what will happen to all these people who depend on the drug market, this work force? What will they do if we put an end to the drug traffic in Mexico? Perhaps it would be better to leave them, because they need to work'. [Applause]

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: Very interesting. I was just thinking that from a museum director's point of view, we do consider these issues and I think it's something we should talk more about in relation to our ethics policies. I'm interested to hear from other people in the room about these kinds of issues. Gordon, do you want to respond to that?

Gordon Knox: I actually have two observations. One is about the ecology of what we're talking about, and the other is the actual content of what's been moved around. The idea that transparency is key is glorious, but it is unfortunately utopian. The market really does look for obscure hidden lines of connections and power. There's much more money to be made there. Just take a look at perhaps one of the examples of a public forum, which is really the government. In 2010, the US Supreme Court determined that it was absolutely all right for dark money to enter into the election process at any rate, in any way, and totally hidden. The introduction of money into these public institutions really brings the US in line with China; the difference is that, in China of course, the government introduces the collusion between industry and the state, whereas in the US it's the industry that is allowed to do that. I wonder whether there really is, first of all, an ecology, a market ecology, that's going to allow for this sort of control or regulation. And the second thing is the nature of the material being discussed here. Art is decidedly different from common market commodities. It really is, and part of it comes from its connective role to society through its criticality. It's designed to be outside—the ideas, the content are designed to be outside the normal flow. So that in itself almost sets it apart from the movement of oil, or gold, or persons or other things. It really is designed to push the parameters and the perimeters of what we understand and challenge what we know. So you have these two things: you have the market defining the sort of nature of global intercourse, and money really controlling that, and the second thing being what we're talking about, moving, are critical concepts and ideas that are challenging even the market.

Luiz Augusto Teixeira de Freitas: I don't know whether to begin with your first comment or with your last comment. It's interesting because I fully understand your way of thinking: that art is something different, that should be treated as something different, but why is it something different when it has turned into a commodity? When it turns into a commodity it ceases to be different. It's different when it's something utopian. For example, I disagree with you when you talk about the utopian so lightly—you spoke about the utopian for five seconds in your discussion, and then you spoke for three minutes about the market, about commodities.

For me, the utopian comes first. When I'm looking at art, I'm looking for Stanley Brown and his utopian thinking of art. What I'm looking for is Walid Raad, what I'm looking for are these utopian people and then we shouldn't have any rules if we were able to have, as I mentioned, artists who are not market-oriented, who are not seduced by the market, who are not becoming involved in the market as market itself, which wants to promote and to sell. No, I completely agree with you. If we were talking about Bruce Nauman lost in the desert, or Gober, I would agree with you one hundred per cent. And these are the guys I'm looking for, the utopian element I'm looking for. The rest, I really don't care about. I only care because some of them are artists that I like and they are being seduced by this. Especially young artists.

Ute Meta Bauer: Yes, I would like to come back to what you said. I think there is a big challenge to everybody involved, as you said, and the art world itself has changed. Yesterday (and I apologise to the Tate, I didn't want to dis them), but we saw that the pressures are there even for big institutions having to accommodate this huge interest in art and culture, fast numbers, etc. I remember with documenta, we had to delude the audience, we had to get them out of the buildings so that they could see the works scattered around the city, so we are facing completely different pressures. The fact that the art market is a whitewashing machine is not something new; the drug market in the eighties was really involved. I don't want to say names or countries, but there were books that were prevented from being published. This is not a new phenomenon, but the pressures that institutions face today even dealing with these different expectations from the political sphere, from the private sphere, have changed a lot. When we did documenta it was really top secret, we could not disclose the list beforehand because it really would have affected the prices of the artists immediately. For us this was a really important ethical factor. People said, 'You're secret', but we said 'No, we're really trying to protect these artists and also other artists who are not in the show'. What has happened in the meantime is that you can no longer do documenta without partnerships. At the last documenta, 50% of the works were co-produced with galleries. So they're already kind of sold on the market before they even go to documenta. This has changed enormously. You cannot do a Venice Biennale any more without dealers financing the contributions of their artists, because it's so expensive. And there is no money, so we really have to address these issues and start sorting out what all this means. As you said, we can't solve it immediately, but we have to begin to address it.

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: Could people say who they are?

Frances Morris: I'm Frances Morris, I work at Tate Modern and one of the aspects of my role is to work closely with collectors and building the collection. We're all new to this new world of interesting collecting, and there is a huge new community of collectors in London, or a huge new community of individuals wanting to collect and wanting to connect with institutions. I don't think we should dis the collectors, because they are part of our lifeblood and are hugely important to artists. I can think of many creative relationships between artists and collectors where the artists' livelihood and their development have been sustained by that relationship, which has preceded by many years institutional relationships. But I believe we need to think about self-regulation and think, as an institution, how our ethical codes can evolve to cope with these new relationships, which I'd like to see as partnerships. I think that as a sector we need to talk to each other about coming to some agreements about how we all work with collectors. I do consider these relationships are important, because what we want to do is encourage newcomers to the field to become better collectors. And I think that's where institutions can have a really major impact, if they put some distance between collecting and the marketplace and focus on education and creative relationships with institutions and collectors. And the heart of that is the artist.

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: Thanks Frances. I think we're out of time, it's coffee time, but I'm sure we'll be returning to these topics in the next session, when we talk more about public and private. I'd like to say a very big thank you to Luiz Augusto. I think he's raised some incredibly important issues and, if nothing else, it's got us all fired up. Maybe transparency and ethics is a topic for another conference. Please join me in thanking our keynote speaker. Thank you. [Applause]

his museum from being something that is there to amuse the director, to being something that is voted by that wider audience as something that should receive higher taxes — that people would be willing to pay higher taxes in order to have such an institution, which is an extraordinary thing to have happened. The quote that he made about the museum director reminds me that the issue of public and private is incredibly complex, because public institutions haven't necessarily always been concerned about that wider public and the use of taxpayers' money. Likewise, as we heard from Rana Sadik, patrons often move away from being patrons into being true philanthropists, where they actually put their money and some of their collections into a situation where they can be used for public interest or for the common good, which neatly brings me to our first presentation from Kate Fowle.

Kate is someone whom I've known for many years. She has had a career that has straddled a lot of these different kinds of institutions, from the Towner Art Gallery and Museum in the south of England, which is a local authority, a municipal gallery, and so directly, if you like, controlled by politicians, through to working in Beijing, at the Center for Contemporary Art, which is essentially a private institution, to the Independent Curators International (ICI) in New York, which is an American not-for-profit institution. She's now working in a situation, which I think she would probably admit is a hybrid: an initiative established by a collector who is now in the shoal of philanthropists and has created an institution which is reaching out to that wider public through education programmes and interactions in Moscow, which is in itself a very interesting context. So without any more ado, please join me in welcoming Kate. [Applause]

---

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: Hearing Shirin Neshat talk about showing her work in this context as opposed to showing it somewhere else, in this museum conference of international curators descending and perhaps reading it rather differently, was very interesting in terms of how context shifts our perspectives. I'm so thrilled at having learnt a new word from an artist: coolwash. Thank you Gabi! [Gabi Ngcobo] I didn't know what coolwash was, I'm assuming it's a reference to greenwash, which most of us are probably familiar with. And I love that quote she gave — I must check where it came from — 'Don't be cool be relevant, and if possible be coolly relevant'. I think we'd all like to be coolly relevant! I think it takes me back to what Graham said at the beginning about how he's transformed

# Perspective 1:

## Kate Fowle

*Biography:* Kate Fowle is Chief Curator at Garage Museum of Contemporary Art in Moscow and Director at Large at Independent Curators International (ICI) in New York. Between 1994 and 1996 she was curator at the Towner Art Gallery and Museum in Eastbourne (East Sussex). Before moving to the United States, in 1996 she formed the curatorial partnership Smith + Fowle in London. In 2002 she co-founded the Masters Program in Curatorial Practice at California College of the Arts (San Francisco), of which she was Chair from that same year until 2007, when she became the first international curator at the Ullens Center for Contemporary Art in Beijing (2007-2008). Between 2009 and 2013 she was Executive Director of Independent Curators International (ICI). Fowle's recent writings include catalogue texts on Doug Aitken, John Baldessari, Harrell Fletcher, Ilya Kabakov, Robert Longo, Ari Marcopoulos, Sterling Ruby, Qiu Zhijie and Althea Thauberger, and articles on curatorship and exhibition practices for publications such as *Parkett*, *Modern Painters*, *Mousse*, *Art in America*, *Manifesta Journal*, *The Exhibitionist* and *Frieze*.

### From Receiving House to Production House: Making Culture Public in Moscow

I've got my timer so I don't go over time. First of all, I'd like to say thank you, two thank yous. The first is for making this the topic of this conference, because it really is, for me, something I think about so much and it's fantastic to really hear so many different perspectives on this question of the relationship between public and private. I also want to say thank you for inviting me to speak, because I recognise it's a privileged position.

Let's see if we can do this.

Slide. So if I'm going to talk about Garage as a case study that can look at new professional practices, which was my given task, I want to create a bit of a frame first because I think it's useful for all of us. We could say that the nineteen nineties is basically the decade when the biennial boom created the possibility for a much wider art world to start to exist. Within that, of course, there was professional development for a number of individuals, and there were also new institutions and structures that were starting, as we've heard in the last few days. But I think that it's the turn of the millennium and the beginning of the two thousands that gives rise to the issues that we have and the questions that we're asking ourselves now, because it's when much bigger amounts of money come into play, the scale of institutions starts to change, the word museum starts to be used much more freely and it's all private scenarios. I'm not sure which is

the first in terms of this new type of privately funded, publicly minded institution, but Mori Art Museum is one of the first in 2003, the Jumex I think it's around 2004 that that started, and then I've got a few others for you to see.

Slide. The second frame I want to give is that of course there is a precedent for this. I think this is a really interesting thing to look back at. I've put two examples up on the screen (there are of course many), but in the United States, the history of privately funded institutions is basically the history of contemporary art museums. I've put up these two examples because I think it's very important to look at the pace at which these privately funded institutions kind of move into the public service, if you like, in terms of governance. If you look at both of them [Whitney Museum of American Art, The Solomon R. Guggenheim Foundation and Museum], it takes thirty years for trustees to become part of the governance structure outside of the family framework. So we could say that, at the time, it took thirty years for people to have decided that the institution that has been privately set up was something they wanted to invest in and they wanted to support, and that it was for the public interest. We could use this argument for now, which means that we all need to wait thirty years, and if we say that it starts at the new millennium then basically we're ten years in to understanding whether any of these

privately funded publicly minded institutions of different types will actually be in the public interest in the end. I think it will be fine to wait thirty years, but I'm extremely extremely concerned. Because of the speed and the way in which things are developing, I think that it's really important for us to think about how to support people who are working in these museums, otherwise we're going to end up with a lot of people who are trained in wrong ways or who are involved in things that are complicated; artists who are going to be involved, publics who are subject to whatever it is that people say. So there is a way, not necessarily through rules, but there is a way, there is an urgency if you like—we can't just wait thirty years.

Slide. I also want to give a little bit of context of Russia, and Moscow in particular, looking at these frameworks and at the fact that 1988 is the beginning of the ecosystem that we now understand the art world to be. So for better or worse, there are many many arguments and strife that all of these changes have produced since 1988: the beginning of auctions, art fairs, the first art biennial in 2005 (which many of you I'm sure went to and froze to death at!). That was the first time really that an effort towards creating an international exhibition or international biennial in Moscow was made.

I've been thinking through what this public and private relationship is, and before 1988 it's fair to say that there was no public exposure for what was classed as unofficial art. You have public interest throughout the whole time but there's official art and unofficial art, and I think that this adds another complication to the mix.

Slide. These are the questions that I've been asking myself whilst here. I've started to think that, basically, one of the things we need to try and do—or what I need to try and do—is think about infrastructures that enable us to develop public and professional trust, or the trust of professionals, because without trust I don't think there's any possible way to get between this public-private question in the contexts in which I've worked twice now. I also think that we have to stop and look at sustainability, both in terms of human and financial resources. I really do think that it's a case of trying to work on a policy level as well as on the ground. For example, in Russia there's no way that things can change if they're not changed at a government level; there's no way that you can necessarily influence the government but there has to be a way in which you can start creating some kind of structure for change.

Slide. So I'm going to run you through the history of Garage so that you can get the official story from me. It was founded in 2008; basically there are three stages to Garage so far. I've realised that these three stages are quite typical of any

institution actually, when you look at them. If you consider, even going back to the Whitney or to the Guggenheim, the number of building changes, the number of different structures behind the institution, the number of changes in emphasis between exhibitions and education is something that I think seems to relate to the evolution of an institution in general; it's not about public or private necessarily.

Slide. The first building was the Bakhmetesky Garage, which Melnikof designed for Leyland buses in Moscow. You can look at this project—and I do see Garage as being a project at this stage—in a couple of different ways. You could say that what the founders were doing was preserving a piece of architecture that is the best example of Melnikov's work; they were preserving something that otherwise was not going to be preserved. Or you could say that it's the Tate effect, or the Tate Modern effect, and that basically to create an institution they went for an extremely large-scale industrial building. It's probably a combination of the two in terms of the interest and desire to completely reconstruct from scratch a building like this.

Slide. So Garage Center for Contemporary Culture, which is how it was known (that's where it got its name from, the bus garage), was in this building until 2012, and if I was to generalise what those years were, they were chiefly a period of time when the institution was open ten months a year. It was project-oriented, it was introducing very established and well-known artists, and providing a platform for the possibility to see work that you wouldn't otherwise necessarily see in Moscow, with a few exhibitions of Russian artists in between.

Slide. Then in 2012 we moved to Gorky Park, which is much closer to the centre of town as you can see, and the garage became the Jewish Museum and the Center for Tolerance, which it still is to this day. I was learning last night from my colleagues that there are many different institutions that may have gone there which are state-funded, but it's the Jewish Museum in the end. Moving into Gorky Park was actually part of a regeneration programme that was a Moscow city initiative. Again, there are many different stages to the park, but in the nineteen nineties it fell into disrepair and it was no longer a place that people were really visiting because it was dangerous. In 2011 the government decided that they were going to regenerate the park, and so Garage became part of that regeneration project. From the beginning there's been this kind of public-private partnership going on in how to develop leisure in the park, and now the park is jam-packed full all summer with rollerbladers and people having fun half naked, even though it's Russia!

Slide. The building that we are currently in is a temporary pavilion designed by Shigeru Ban, built

specifically for Garage, that has 800 square metres of space. Alongside there you can see, where the red flags are, the Education Center, which was an existing building, a changing room for sport, and was transformed into an education centre based on the fact that we needed to have more space for all the people coming. As you can see, it's very casual. It's a place that attracts people from the park, but it's also a café and there's a bookshop, so it uses that odd system of getting people in who don't know they want to see art and then pushing them through to the gallery.

Slide. These are just some images of the education centre. Basically, what we've discovered now is that there needs to be a way in which we no longer just look at how to develop education around the subjects that we're actually dealing with, but how we can start to provide an infrastructure for people who want to engage with art more fully. So we're literally doing contemporary art history courses and classes and creating a bigger context for people who want it, because this kind of material is not given in schools.

Slide. The next couple of slides are just trying to connect what I've just told you, which were the bare bones, with the development of professional praxis and what that might mean. Here you can see the audience figures, and then at the bottom, what happened over those years. Garage was exhibition-oriented—it was making exhibitions, there were outside curators, the office was mainly in London, Dasha was very involved in the programming and planning, there was another woman called Molly Dent-Brocklehurst who was also predominantly based in London and coming over. In 2010 Anton Belov became the first director of the institution, and he was Russian, he lived in Russia and was interested from his own perspective to be building an institution that he wanted to visit himself. He was thirty-two years old, and so part of this post-Soviet generation that wants to build a different Moscow.

Slide. What I should say is that when Anton arrived he started to develop the education programme and he also introduced the marketing and development departments because, contrary to popular belief, we do actually raise money as well. We have a percentage from Dasha as the founder, and then we also raise money to support the programme.

What was interesting—and again, this seems to be true regardless of public or private—was that when we were moving from the Bakhmetevsky garage to the Gorky Park location there were a number of months when we had no location whatsoever, and this seemed to offer the staff, an particularly Anton as the director, the opportunity to think about what it was that he needed to create a public institution if he had no building. So this is

when he started an extensive publishing programme and it's when the development of the archive started (I'll talk more about these later). It's basically a time when he started to think outwards and to think directly about the audience. Since we've been in Gorky Park it is now a public institution seven days a week, twelve months a year. There's a Human Resources department, there are application processes, and it is running extensively as an institution that is for the people, particularly the people who work there.

Slide. I can't say the average age, but the people who work there are basically between twenty-two and thirty-five years old, apart from me, the accountants and the lawyers, which I find really interesting. As they've told me, the staff working there were literally outraged at the fact that I suggested we would build an institution; they didn't want an institution because an institution is a Soviet model, like a university, and neither are right. So they're building a place to which they want to bring their parents, their grandparents, children, their brothers and sisters. They want a place for culture in Moscow. And when you look at the age range, surprisingly to me, it's a very small number of people who are forty-five and over who are coming to the institution. I think that's something that we need to change, but it does reflect the staff and the attitude of the institution, if you like.

Slide. One more thing that I should say is that once we started working in Gorky Square, as you saw from that graph of audience, we lost a lot of audience with the move and then we had to build it up again. It was at that stage when we started wanting to try and understand who the audience was, rather than it just being this kind of faceless public. I did an awful lot of research and, to this day, continue to talk to them.

I wanted to just bring up the fact that when moved from the Garage Center for Contemporary Culture to Garage Museum (and I'll talk about that in a second), our strapline changed: we were a platform for new thinking and now we're basically an institution where people, art and ideas make history. So we've moved from this notion of a platform, which is something that is passive and that literally jettisons people, at best, but doesn't do much to a place. We need to think about what is actually happening in the longer term.

Slide. So when we changed the word 'museum' in the title, and 'contemporary art' it was for a number of reasons. One because 'Garage Center for Contemporary Culture' didn't have the words 'art', or 'contemporary art' in it; we could call it a 'centre for contemporary art' but there is a National Centre for Contemporary Arts in Moscow. But we also wanted to use the word 'museum' because it reflects commitment. Traditionally, much

much broader publics than those of contemporary art understand that a museum is a place that hoards culture, and so to try and think about that commitment we got funding from the city to organise a conference on the contemporary museum, which was called The Reflexive Museum. In Russian it was more the 'active' or the 'direct' museum, a museum that takes action rather than a museum that just sits still.

Slide. We started on a professional level, before moving on and literally did a number of large projects in which we talked to people about what a contemporary museum is. So it's important to realise that the words 'contemporary' and 'modern' in Russian are the same, there is no differentiation between the two. Here I'm just showing you ways of thinking about what public interest actually could be from the perspective of Garage.

Slide. It's really really important to provide access, and access can only happen if there's training, so we're working on training on a number of different levels: from staff to starting a mediator school (because there's no training for mediators), to a Teens Club, which is working with the institution. So there are a number of different levels, as if we don't work on these levels there's no way that we can actually build something that is public.

Slide. The publishings. As I say, we're doing a lot of translations, because if you don't provide people with the opportunity to read in Russian about contemporary culture, then everybody's on the wrong footing in the first place, because you're dealing with translations. We're also producing books that are about different histories that basically come out of our archive.

Slide. There is a library that will be opening, the first public library for contemporary art, because critics and curators don't have access to all the back catalogues from documenta, or magazines, for example. It's really important to give people the chance to create their own criticality.

Slide. Field Research is a programme wherein artists, curators and thinkers can be supported by Garage in terms of research and finances, to look into histories that are either overlooked or under-established in Russia. There are a number of different ways in which we can start to create different stories with professionals who are interested in doing much deeper research.

Slide. In terms of the exhibitions, one of the things that I think are interesting, particularly after the speech just now, is that what I decided to do when I arrived was to do a year of exhibitions that didn't have one big name or artist, no solo shows, nothing that could actually start to sway this whole thing about the market in relation to the programming and what exhibitions could do. So all the exhibitions are based on thinking through how to

engage with different publics, and what the ecosystem actually is.

Slide. Again, time seems to be important. I've been thinking about time a lot. We're trying to slow down how you think something through. If you're expecting your public to understand different projects that change every four weeks, and there's no space for dialogue before or after, then you're not building any way in which people can join into conversations with criticality. So we turned the whole exhibition space into a conference before we did an exhibition around the history of performance, which is the exhibition that's on now.

Slide. This is a hundred years of Russian performance, because it's a topic that's never been researched. It's been four years of research in a number of different ways (which is a much longer conversation). This is the publication in Russian, and there is an English one will come out as soon as I manage to do it!

Slide. One quick note on the archive. Returning to the conversation about the museum, it was very intentional that we used the word 'museum', and it was based on the fact that we have an archive collection, not a collection of contemporary art, because of this whole issue of being a privately funded publicly minded institution. Let alone what it means internationally, in Russia it's important for a couple of reasons. To understand the history of contemporary Russian art, from the nineteen nineties forward, you need to understand through archives as much as you need to understand through works. There are many works that didn't actually make it out the other end, works that are in places that can't be found, so it's the evidence, if you like. This archive was founded in the nineteen nineties, it begins as the Art Project Foundation Archive. They were in Moscow from 1994 to 1997, and when they left there was one woman who carried on building that archive slowly, with very little funding. It's that archive that is now at the heart of Garage, with the woman who started it, with funding to continue to build it, with staff that can actually start to digitise it. So that's why it was important to say that if you're going to create a museum and it's a repository for experiences, you need to be able to mine the experiences and they need to be made public as much as the final works, because that's not necessarily the way that you're going to tell the history of contemporary art in Russia.

All right, so I'm going to stop there because she stood up. [Laughter] And now I get shot!  
[Applause]

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: Thank you for being so obedient Kate!

I was thinking earlier we've been looking at that this whole question of public and private from a particular lens, perhaps too much from the interior, and that what we needed to do was flip it and look at it from the other side, which is the audience and what we're doing it for, who we're doing it for. As I think I've referenced earlier, sometimes 'public' institutions can be doing things that are very self-referential and only for themselves, and here we have an example of a 'private' institution that clearly has a very strong ethos in terms of its audience, so thank you for flipping that for us Kate.

This leads me very neatly into introducing our

next presentation by Bernard Blistène, the Director of the Musée national d'art moderne, Paris. He needs no introduction — he's had an incredible career, and both within and outside the Pompidou, concerned not just with art, but with theatre and music, and more cross-disciplinary aspects of engaging with audiences. I think the Pompidou, as a major national institution, was probably one of the first to really start to deal with this issue of a large public audience that goes beyond a narrow art world. And its incredible building of course, which attracted many tourists and many people who weren't going necessarily for art. So please join me in welcoming Bernard Blistène. [Applause]

## Perspective 2

# Bernard Blistène

*Biography:* Born in 1955, Bernard Blistène joined the Pompidou Centre in 1983 as a curator after completing his studies at the École du Louvre, and went on to hold various positions at the museum. In 1990 he became head of the Musées de Marseille, where he created the city's first contemporary art museum. Six years later he returned to the Pompidou Centre as Deputy Director. In 2002 he was appointed by the French Ministry of Culture to the specific task of developing the vacant spaces of the Palais de Tokyo. His accomplishments as curator include *The Museum that Didn't Exist* (2002), a solo show of Daniel Buren's work co-curated by Alison Gingeras and Laurent Le Bon and displayed in the framework of *La Force de l'Art* at the Grand Palais in 2006, and the 2007 show *A Theatre without Theatre* with Yann Chateigné at MACBA, where he explored the relationship between the theatre and the visual arts. Blistène also taught contemporary art at the École du Louvre, where he was known for establishing relations between visual arts and cinema. In 2009 he created the first Nouveau Festival at the Pompidou, various spaces of which became the sites of ephemeral performances linked to a thematic exhibition, thus evoking the centre's origins as an active, inventive venue.

Thank you for inviting me to talk. I will try to be cool and relevant!

Well, I occupied my position ten months ago as Director of Musée national d'art moderne. As some of you know, I was in charge of the other Centre Pompidou department for five years, and I had been a curator at Centre Pompidou between 1983 and 1990, just before leaving for Marseille, where I became the director of the museum [Musées de Marseille] between 1990 and 1997, approximately.

So I've always been working for public institutions; I've never been involved with any private institution. I'm what we call in France, *un fonctionnaire* [a civil servant]. I love to be *un fonctionnaire*. [Laughter] Anyway, it seems that it

would definitely be hard for me to deal with private institutions, despite the fact that, as you know, I have been working with many other museums. Sometimes you don't know whether you're dealing with a private or a public institution. By the way, when I work with MoMA, the Museum of Modern Art in New York, I forget the fact that I'm working with a private institution. Why? Well, because all we do is linked to our colleagues. And once again, it seems to me that if I'm here with you today, first of all it's because I do love this connection, despite the fact that, as we know, we are all in a very bad situation, to be frank, quite a lot of things can be developed precisely through this confidence between people. So, as I said, I occupied my position ten months ago inside this huge cultural centre named Centre Pompidou.

All of know that something changed when Pompidou decided to build this institution in the late sixties. I must say that there was a before and after Centre Pompidou, for better or worse.

There is something else which has to be underlined. The Musée national d'art moderne, which I am supposed to lead, is inside the Centre Pompidou. It is one of the two departments of Centre Pompidou, which, as you know, also includes a public library and a contemporary institute for music, IRCAM, which was ruled by Pierre Boulez in the beginning. This complexity explains both the specificity and the difficulties of Centre Pompidou which every director had and still has to deal with. My friend and former colleague Alfred Pacquement is the only one who remained for twelve years at the head of the museum. It is not naïve to remember that the great Dominique Bozo spent no more than four years as the museum director, that Jean-Hubert Martin stayed less than three years as museum director, and that Werner Spies spent just a couple of years as museum director. Well, good for me, just ten months, I hope to spend more!

But anyway, these are the points that we have to underline to understand this complexity. This means that before talking about public interest and private museums we need to remember the specificity and the complexity of Centre Pompidou — of the Musée nationale d'art moderne inside the Centre Pompidou. Another point that has to be stressed when we start to talk is that Centre Pompidou is a national, public institution with almost five million visitors a year.

Well, if we now go back to the subject, we must all remember French tradition that, as you know, has nothing to do with what we call *philanthropie* [philanthropy]. It's a tradition that belongs to the state, which is a deep emanation of the power of the state, from Louis XIV to Jack Lang (at another level, of course) and François Mitterand. There is in France a tradition deeply anchored in our culture, a tradition that has been protected until today. We could say that the challenge will be to preserve it but to adapt it to the varied and brittle truths of today.

These distinctions between public and private institutions came to mind a couple of weeks ago, with quite a lot of fanfare, the Vuitton Foundation opened in Paris. Even if we are all greatly involved in the development of such huge private institutions in Paris, we must bear in mind that during the next few years quite a lot of large institutions will open which, as you know, will deeply change the relationship between public and private institutions. Don't forget that up until now the Louis Vuitton Foundation, like many others, gave money to our institutions to support our activities, and all this money will go directly to this institution, leaving a

big gap for all of us, a deficit in our public funding.

The distinction between public interest and private resources is becoming a huge problem for us in France, one which we do not yet know how to solve. My American colleagues have known for a while how to deal with public and private. A museum curator, even if he refuses to—I'm thinking of my friend Robert Storr—has to deliver the project and the money required to build it. It has never been like this in my country, where up until now there was a big difference between, say, my job as a curator and my job as a fund-raiser. It was almost insane, vulgar, for a curator to think about money. And I must say that quite a lot of people in my own team still think the same: 'Bernard, you need to find the money for us. This is your job, as a museum director, to get and to give us the possibility to develop our scientific research'. [Laughter] 'Trust me, I'll do my best, even though I don't want to spend all my time thinking about it.'

Then comes something else, which is one of the specificities and, I must say, one of the qualities of the Musée national d'art moderne: its fantastic collection. For quite a long time there was a gap between the permanent collection and the exhibitions. For a long time, this permanent collection was supposed to build the narrative of the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. There were not really many links between the permanent collection and the exhibitions. In my opinion, it will be another step to combine them, and to reorganise the relationship between them. The permanent collection has to become a tool to activate as well the relationship between the public and the exhibitions. It certainly has to be exploited at different levels. How are we going to do this? The first step will be to restructure the permanent collection and to develop it inside the building itself and, of course, outside. I was a little surprised at seeing all those exhibitions of great masterpieces all over the world, with always the same works by Chagall, Dalí, Picasso, etc. I was a little upset by that, when quite a lot of my colleagues said to me, 'Well, you see, this is the only way to make money for your institution, and you're a lucky guy with such a collection, you can sell your works, your Chagalls and Picassos, to the Arab world, to China, wherever'.

I would like to do something else, and one step towards what we are supposed to develop in the next few years will, of course, be to use and to work with this collection but to try and build projects with our colleagues in a different perspective. Let me give you an example from Singapore.

I had been in touch with people in Singapore and we decided to work together. At first I didn't know exactly what we were supposed to do, but after many conversations we thought that we could

build something specific, something which could definitely become one statement by the two cultures. Of course, the collection will provide the resources to build it, but on the other hand, my colleague, who is with us today, decided to develop one statement, one specific statement. This means that such a collection offers the possibility to explore and to find certain specificities, and can also enable to build an adapted and specific project. I would like to say that I'm fed up with these big blockbusters that don't bring anything new to the history of art. What I do feel as a real challenge is to resist the pressure of what we all have to deal with, and to reinforce the historical statement that we can develop with our colleagues around the world. Such a situation, of course, can be developed if you can work with a collection in a context where, as you know, public finances are dramatically run down.

Let me give you some examples. Between 2009 and 2013 we've lost around ten million euros of the Centre Pompidou's budget. The subsidy that covered 94% of the budget in the year 2000 now only covers 83%. A few years ago, as the difficulties became greater and greater, the Musée national d'art moderne decided to close some of its spaces. At the time we thought that the result could help us obtain some solutions from the state. They didn't care at all. They didn't even refer to it, and I must say in front of one of my colleagues, who was the director of Centre Pompidou at the time of that exhibition, the impact was zero. The fact that such an institution closed some of its rooms and exhibitions didn't have any influence at all on the state or on the administration.

We had to develop our own fund-raising. That's what we've been doing between 2007 and today, and have developed some of our own resources from twenty million to thirty-seven million euros. In 2013, the Centre Pompidou managed to raise 35% of its budget through self-financing, a level never reached before. In the meantime, some people said 'if you're going to develop something with the permanent collection inside the building, you'll have to find ways of developing projects outside. As some of you may remember, we organised the project entitled *Elle: Women Artists from the Centre Pompidou* at the Seattle Art Museum in the States, and in Rio de Janeiro and Belorizonte in Brazil. In a way, this is a good example of cooperation between institutions because the project, as I said before, was built with our colleagues. Some time later, in 2013, we tried to develop something with the King Abdullah Center for World Culture at Dhahran [Saudi Arabia]; I can't say that it was really successful. We'd been working with Saudi Aramco [Oil Company], who of course has given us a lot of money, but I must say that the result was not what we could have expected in

terms of creating networks with professionals.

As you've heard, we're now going to try and develop a new kind of institution with Centre Pompidou Pop-Up; I guess that some of you have read that we're going to start something in Malaga, in the south of Spain, where we're going to lend a part of the collection for a few years. It's a new context, definitely something whose outcome is not yet known, but I must say that such a project can be another step, or perhaps another concept. It's not something we've done before with any other institution, but in a way it can be an alternative to our situation.

So as a provisional conclusion, I must say that the problem for us is not, of course, only to seek private resources, but to maintain a standard of exhibitions and a standard of alternatives which we certainly need to develop together. I think that it is inside an assembly such as this, between colleagues, that solutions can be found. I am a little sceptical about the fact that quite a lot of institutions try to make money without thinking of reducing their expenses. To me this goal, or this gap, is precisely something I would like to consider during the next few years. It seems to me that we all produce exhibitions that cost very great amounts of money. I believe that we all have to fight against the fact that the prediction of exhibitions is definitely linked to the subject matter of this journey. In my opinion, if we don't lose sight of the professionalism of the world of art, then some solutions can be developed. If we open what we do to outsiders who don't care about artistic problems, I think that this can be the beginning of the end of our vocation, and it is definitely why I think that an institution such as Centre Pompidou has to give an example, and has to resist—to resist outside, but I must also say clearly, to resist inside—the pressure of the politicians who, as you all know, are steering the course of this big ship. Thank you. [Applause]

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: Thank you Bernard. That was a fantastic contrast to Kate's discussion. I think in the museum world we all endlessly debate this notion of blockbusters; what we mean by it and the demand from politicians and others, trustees and so on, to generate money and whether blockbusters and exhibitions of great masters are the way to do it. I think some of us in the room would be pretty envious of the fact that your public funding is only dropped to 83% [laughter], and good for the French to have maintained that for so long! Maybe we should all be arguing for it to go up again, but those days I'm afraid are long gone, and having lived through the UK government in the days of Thatcher, when the rot really started, when the attacks on public institutions began, I do think it's extraordinary that France has managed to maintain the funding for its national institutions for so long.

## Questions and Answers

Elizabeth Ann Macgregor: I'm open to the floor for questions. I'd like to kick off one myself though, to Kate, about terminology. I'm curious about the fact that you want to call it a museum, because I've been having this discussion in our context about the word museum being an off-putting word, a word that doesn't actually engage with the public. You're sitting next to someone whose institution may be the Musée d'art moderne but is actually more commonly known as the Centre d'Art Pompidou. So, why museum? Just to kick us off, thanks.

Kate Fowle: Because it depends on what battle you want to pick. If you're working in a situation in which the word contemporary doesn't exist, you can't separate it from modern; if there hasn't been any access to contemporary art before 1988, the first contemporary art department in a museum opened in the early nineties, then the word museum is at least a word that people actually understand, and then you can start to discuss what a museum means. That's why we talked about a museum being active, it's why we use adjectives around the museum to activate it rather than deactivate it.

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: Thank you. Questions from the floor? Any hands up there? There's one over there, Ann-Sofi. Can I remind everyone to say who they are first?

Ann-Sofi Noring: I'm Ann-Sofi Noring, and I'm co-director at Moderna Museet in Stockholm. Thank you both for the introductions to your institutions, which were very interesting. I was thinking that it depends very much on when you are and where you are, the context. Speaking about Paris, I came to think of our first director, who was also Centre Pompidou's first director, Pontus Hultén, who really tried to make Moderna Museet into a 'culture house'. Specifically, he tried to move it from an island to the centre of the city, which is now the culture house (and is pretty empty, but anyway), he moved on to Paris and he made these ideas and visions true and workable for a couple of years. So, I was a little curious, Bernard, when you talked about the project in Malaga, because you have another space in Metz I understand, so what are your thoughts about expanding from where you are to another space? What are you thinking about in terms of change and development, the collection and exhibitions, making this move?

Bernard Blistène: Well, the collection of the Centre Pompidou, or of the Musée national d'art moderne, is funny you know, because people confuse the two. I remember something important that took place quite a long time ago, in the late

nineties I guess, when the administration decided to change the name 'Collection du Musée national d'art moderne' into 'Collection du Centre Pompidou'. If the words are meaningful, this was certainly another perspective. The collection has about one hundred thousand works, no, even more, but only 2% of the collection is on view, which is totally crazy! We tried, but it's very hard for many reasons, the workers, etc., to dedicate more energy and change the display of the collection more often than we've done in the past. But if we want to do that, we'll need to turn to workers who are outsiders, who do not form part of the team. So it costs a lot of money, and, once again, it's a loop and things are what they are — only 2% of this fantastic collection is on view. So we decided to open Metz, Centre Pompidou Metz, built by Shigeru Ban, without a collection — which in a way is funny, because we've built a museum without a collection, a museum which looks more like a *centre d'art*. Metz is a *centre d'art*, structurally if you like, and as you know, its collection is a selection of works that come from Centre Pompidou. We all know that this is not enough, and that we need temporary exhibitions to activate the public. If we only showed the permanent collection in Metz, for example, the selection of works from the permanent collection, I imagine that it would collapse in a couple of years or even less. So our target was definitely to work with the collection. Quite a lot of things have been done, and as you know as colleagues, Centre Pompidou is a big lender, something like seven thousand works a year, which requires a huge team, quite a lot of people working to achieve it. But it is also a necessity of course, we need to lend for our exhibitions. If you add all this up you'll see that it doesn't solve anything, it costs a lot of money, so for a while they (I don't want to say 'I') decided to send the collection all over the world. For better and for worse. For better, when it is well done, very articulated, in relation or in dialogue with someone who wants to take part in the game as we tried to do together with Eugene [Tan]. For worse, when it's just a selection of masterpieces to make money. This is what I would like to try and change a little. To do this we would need to develop some specific projects in connection with specific people who want to do more than to bring masterpieces to their own countries; who want to share the same idea of what an institution can offer, in order to develop let's say culture, art and social meaning through their activities. We will have to work hard to find a solution to be able to build these projects. As I've said, we've now begun to do that. But even though we've managed to retained an 83% subsidy from the state, which I know is something specific to France, something really relevant that forms a part of our culture, from Louis XIV to Jack Lang, the

famous 1% of the state's budget (that we never got but anyway, that was our target), consider what we've lost. So in order to do this, we'll need to find a balance between what we call blockbusters, which can be great exhibitions (I'm thinking of the great Dalí show which travelled to the Reina Sofía in Spain and received almost one million visitors but also cost a lot of money to produce) and smaller exhibitions, which I would like to develop within the programme of the collection on quite specific subjects. These smaller exhibitions will create a balance with the big blockbusters which, and this is the brittle truth, we need. I'm not going to explain to you what our programme will consist in (although if you ask me I shall), but I will try to find a balance between the blockbusters—let's say one a year—and other exhibitions at other levels; other shows which will be built inside the collection to reactivate its relationship with the public. The gap between the number of visitors to the permanent collection and the number of visitors to the temporary exhibitions was really too big. This gap must definitely be reduced, which means that we'll have to redirect the collection throughout the complexity and diversity of the building that houses it.

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: Thank you, Bernard. Any other questions? Anybody burning to ask something? I think this question of event and exhibition-driven audiences is an interesting one and a concern that we all have with the fact that if you only show your collection, nobody comes. It's not a truth that we particularly want to face up to, but how can we actually address that question? Maybe it's a topic for a future conference.

Did I see a hand over there? Yes.

Bernard Blistène: I would like to add something. Even in France, even in Paris, most of the visitors to Centre Pompidou are Parisians. Quite a lot of people think that most of the visitors are tourists, but this is not true at all. I don't remember—maybe Catherine you do—but only 28% are tourists, which is something that we need to consider, as it means that the other 72% are Parisians or French. But it means that if what they see is always the same, then they won't come back.

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: Yes, thank you. Question?

Laura Barlow: Yes, I'm Laura, I'm working at Mathaf, and I have a question for Kate. I think it was very interesting to hear you speak about the programmes you've initiated for mediating, and also training staff, to develop the institution with you. I was wondering whether you could speak a bit about what those are, and how much the discussion about the institution's founding and it being a privately financed institution is a part of that discussion with them because, as you were saying, I think it's an interesting debate to have about how that is

communicated to the public and how the staff is able to do that.

Kate Fowle: Well, there are different levels of training. For example, starting programme meetings, encouraging people from the development department, the publishing department, to come together and talk about what a programme is, rather than what exhibitions they want to do. Getting people to present the exhibitions they want to work on, getting the development department to present their interests. On the next level, a number of the members of staff have direct contact with the audiences; the mediators are the highest level, if you like, but there are all the people at the front of desk, the invigilators, the guards... We had smiling training, that was the first one [laughter]. So it works on many many different levels, as I well understand that some of those people will be the directors of the future as well, and that they're working at Garage because they love culture. When it comes to talking about Dasha, the founder, and how it all started, it's very open—Dasha sent me a text yesterday because I was telling her about this and saying 'I really want to talk to you about it, and what is actually going on', and she said 'Oh I'm going to come and see the show on Wednesday', and she talks to the staff and sees them. So, on a human level, there's something there, and then on a policy level, the kinds of questions that are being asked here are not asked in the same way. The thing is how to create the agency to be able to think about the questions you want to ask, because the very notion of the museum is the thing that we're having the conversation about. The idea of public or private, as Olga said last night, is not a conversation that is being held, because the public... everything was public, so it's not being discussed in the same way. I think it would be interesting if it was, so it's just a case of starting these conversations.

Bernard Blistène: May I say something? We try to preserve the distinction between private and public, but if you consider that the artists are the patrons of the museum, if you consider that the greatest works in the collection of Centre Pompidou come from the artists themselves... where do you place the artists? As patrons? In the private sphere? It seems to me there are two ways in which to consider this distinction between private and public, that if you look back at the history of an institution such as Centre Pompidou, this imbrication between private and public did exist for a while, not under the pressure of money but under the pressure of making collections, creating what are in fact the roots of the institution itself.

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: Yes, that's a very good point, the changing context.

Did we have someone else, Jeremy?

Jeremy Lewison: Bernard, your statistic of

2% of the collection being on view is obviously a common problem to many large museums, and it actually touches on issues to do with funding and finance, and issues to do with private and public, and accessibility. I think museums have tried to address the question of how much to preserve, how much to retain, whether to deaccession or not deaccession, and fail to deal with the issue: museums go on and on collecting, which requires more and more storage, more and more outlets, whether it's Malaga, Metz or somewhere else. I wondered whether you'd like to comment on the problems that you and your colleagues will face fifty years hence, as you go on collecting in the volumes that you collect, and what that impact is going to have on funding, expenditures and everything else.

Bernard Blistène: No deaccession ever. The history of an institution is the history of taste. Look and try to remember how quite a lot of works which were in storage are now on view. If you saw what we called *Modernités plurielles*, which was not really a great exhibition, I must say that it brought back quite a lot of works which had remained in storage for years and years. No deaccession ever. More storage? Yes, and why not? More storage for what? Just to keep works, or perhaps in order to find other relationships between the public and works? This is something we think about: if the access of the public to storage is not successful, it doesn't work, but if the museum also wants to develop its potential possibilities for research, for becoming too a space for students or whatever, it seems to me that such a collection is really a treasure. So, no deaccession, more storage and perhaps more dispatching, lending. In France, for example, we need to reconsider the relationship between Paris, the centre, the capital, and other institutions. That's something we've done before; it takes us back to Le décret de l'An I, when Napoleon I sent masterpieces to the collections of twenty-two institutions in France, twenty-two new museums. The Palais de Longchamp in Marseille was built with these funds from the state. Once again, it's something that differs between countries; in France it's a repetition of the dialogue between Jacobins and Girondins, the question of being or not centralised. In my opinion, an institution like Centre Pompidou has to reactivate its relationship with museums in different places all over France. This is something that we've done, and it is something which we have to reconsider again and again. It also means that we may need to structure the team itself, and its vocation. In my opinion, quite a lot of people have to be devoted to this mission, perhaps many more than is actually the case.

I believe in long-term deposits, because I think that one single exhibition that lasts three or four months is just *un coup* [a stunt]. I think that if we can find, with some of our colleagues, the possibility

of doing something long-term—one, two even more years, which is what we're going to try and do with Malaga—then this could open some perspectives. Because there are quite a number of large institutions without collections, as you know. There are quite a number of museums that are overdesigned, and some huge buildings without collections, so maybe the time has come to use and to build something in order to dispatch things in another way.

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: Anybody else? Don't tell me you've run out of ideas! Is everybody hungry, is that what it is? Is that somebody at the back there, did I see a hand go up? There's a brave person putting up their hand at the back there!

Q: I had pretty much a similar question to the previous one, but I'm still struggling with the term permanent collection, as this is a vast, an enormous collection, and you mentioned that you're showing 2% of it. How permanent would this collection really be for the future? I'm totally ignorant about this legislation, but in my country we also have a cultural law that forbids national institutions such as our museum to sell pieces of cultural heritage, so it's the same. Maybe there are some other examples, but how can you deal with this? Do you have any kind of assessment, after fifty years, when acquisition policies were going in completely different directions? Or do you perhaps just keep some parts of this permanent collection hidden low in the basement and never show them? That's what bothers me.

Bernard Blistène: Well, to return to the question of museums in progress, public interest, private resources, it seems to me that the real question is to know what we definitely want to do with our institution. That is really the question. For me, if we are to resist what we know we have to build an alternative to the double situation we find everywhere today. So to build a narrative inside such an institution, with such a collection, is definitely the mission. Today, quite a lot of institutions have lost this mission in today's global complexity (although we're not going to discuss again global, local, or whatever). In such a large institution—I'm aware that I'm at the head of a large institution, although sometimes I dream it's a smaller one—the thing is to know what to do with it, and which role, which position you want to establish, even if it is difficult. The position which we have to establish is that of proposing an alternative to what we know is becoming the definitive invasion of the market. So, if we're able to do that with such a collection, we'll need to rearticulate something in terms of signification. The question of meaning is one that I hope we'll win; it may be something of a dream, but it is what we need to do. What we are doing now is rehanging the collection, so when you

visit Paris in March you'll see a complete rehanging of the historical collection, inside which some twenty rooms will remain open in order to build a new focus every six months open to art criticism, to the history of art, to debates and so on. In the meantime, we're trying to expand the space inside the building, and we've come across approximately 2000 m<sup>2</sup>, which is not a lot but it's something. As I told you, we're also beginning to rearticulate some of the temporary rooms, what we call *galeries contemporaines*, for instance, will be divided into two parts: one part will be devoted to contemporary exhibitions (the next one will be Dominique Gonzalez Foerster, followed by Jean-Luc Moulène, etc.); the other part will focus on a large ensemble of works in the collection, I'm not sure yet but something like Arte Povera, Minimalism, Conceptualism or whatever, where painting is today, for instance, which we will connect with other departments, to give lectures, to articulate something. I'm also making a deal with the university, the Centre Pompidou will deliver not a Ph.D. but something similar which will bring students to the interior of the building. This has never been done before and it will give students the possibility of working with the collections. This is something that has to be quite visible, let's say as an artistic and cultural statement. As Jean-Luc Godard said, 'La culture est la règle et l'art est l'exception' [Culture is the rule, and art is the exception]. And it fits, even inside Centre Pompidou. By the way, the Centre Pompidou is 'Centre d'art et de culture', which means that we have to deal both with art and with culture.

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: Thank you.  
Bartomeu?

Bartomeu Marí: Yes, I have a question for both of you. It concerns the management of collections. The museum I work for belongs to an association that is going to initiate a movement of opinion against the rental of works of art from any public collection to any other public collection. It is a fact that not only large museums but also museums that depend on municipalities or regional governments, are obliging their managers to rent works of art out when they are loaned to other exhibitions. I would like to know what you think about this policy.

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: So you mean the institution charges a fee instead of the exchange of works of art that would have monetary value attached to it?

Bartomeu Marí: Exactly.

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: You're not talking about renting them out to corporations, are you? That might be a bit radical!

Bartomeu Marí: No, no, no, to any other museum. It's not about the costs that are involved.

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: No, it's about making money.

Bartomeu Marí: It's about making money, clearly.

Bernard Blistène: Do you want an answer about Malaga?

Bartomeu Marí: No. [Laughter]

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: It's a nuance.

Bartomeu Marí: Not at all, it's about a policy. I know that the Musée national d'art moderne is asked to do so, but smaller museums all over Europe are also asked to do so. It's a general policy.

Bernard Blistène: We never request money for lending the collection. Never never. We never did so.

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: No, but there's pressure now.

Bernard Blistène: No, it's good because you know even the director sometimes misses a few things! So tell me what happened to you. Don't forget that behind you you have the former director of production of Centre Pompidou, so I will need her help! No jokes, no, the brittle truth here! Tell me what happened to you, I need an answer! It seems to me that this dialogue has to be very concrete also.

Bartomeu Marí: Concretely, it was a work, a film by Gil Wolman, that was asked on loan and there was a fee requested depending on the time of the exhibition of this film and we ended up pirating it.

Bernard Blistène: Ah, it's about films and it's something specific.

Bartomeu Marí: Well, it's a work.

Bernard Blistène: No, come on, this is something specific. Bartomeu is talking about a film by Gil Wolman, the Lettrist artist, the great Lettrist artist. The films we have in the collection we cannot lend outside the museum. We've only got the rights for screening them inside. This is something that has been done like this in France for a very long time. We acquire the rights for projecting them inside. If you request to show them outside, you need to deal with the estate. That's why they charge you for a film, but it has nothing to do with us, absolutely nothing. Does that answer your question? I'm not lying. This is the truth. [Laughter] Come on, I can lie, even in front of you, but I'm not, this is the truth.

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: Okay, we've clarified that.

Bernard Blistène: The same goes for the video collection. You must know that this fantastic collection, I don't know how you do it at the Tate, but for us, the video collection can only be used inside the building; we cannot use the rights for any kind of loans. So when you lend videos you need to request the rights from the producer.

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: Thank you Bernard. There are issues around film. I think we have time for one more question.

Colin Dune, from Bucharest: You mentioned two locations, Malaga and Singapore. I understand there is a more intense relationship with Singapore, you mentioned Eugene Tan and the conversations

you had. But the question still remains open: is there a strategy for different locations? Is it a matter of chance? Is it a matter of local expectations? How does this build up?

Bernard Blistène: Malaga is a political strategy, and Singapore is an artistic strategy. Is that an answer?

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: Yes, a good answer!

Bernard Blistène: But maybe the answer could be... Eugene, do you want to answer?

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: I would like to hear from Eugene.

Bernard Blistène: Yes, it could be exciting to learn when we met, how we decided to work together.

Eugene Tan: Yes, I guess Bernard and I have both joined our institutions recently, and when we joined them when we realised there was an agreement between the two institutions to work on an exhibition. I suppose we changed the terms of the engagement, and we both co-curated an exhibition which we felt was relevant to both for us as institutions, rather than just showing the collections of the Centre Pompidou.

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor: Thank you. I think we're out of time. I think there's a very interesting point surfacing here though, which is about this question of money, the monetisation of collections.

We all know that big institutions now do tend to go beyond the old-fashioned idea of a fee, a touring fee, which we all knew covered costs, into something which actually makes money for the institution, which of course exacerbates the power relations to which we've already referred. And while that may be valid when you're talking perhaps about a major initiative, how soon will it be before it does begin to creep into individual loans? So if we want to borrow work from the Pompidou or the Tate, or anywhere else, will we eventually have to pay for it? I think it's probably a topic for another time. I'd like you to thank both our presenters of today. You'll have a chance again this afternoon, the topic will continue. Hopefully we'll come back to the provocation we had this morning about the art market and its relationship with the public sector. Two very interesting perspectives on what we mean by the public interest. I'm looking forward particularly to following that topic at future conferences: who are we doing it for? Why are we doing it? What constitutes our public? And maybe that's a better way of thinking about institutions rather than thinking about institutions themselves and their ethics policies, not that ethics is not very important. So please join me in thanking Bernard Blistène and Kate Fowle, and enjoy your lunch. Thank you. [Applause]

---

# Public to Private and Private to Public: What Are The New Professional Practices?

Mami Kataoka: My name is Mami Kataoka and I'm chief curator of the Mori Art Museum and a new board member of CIMAM as well. This is going to be Discussion 3, our last discussion, and will follow our morning's conversation and also cover the discussions we've had over the last three days. So I have invited Luiz Augusto, Kate Fowle and Bernard Blistène from the morning sessions and, in addition, I have invited Fionn Meade, Senior Curator of Cross-Disciplinary Platforms at the Walker Art Center, Minneapolis, on our right, and Eugene Tann, Director of the National Gallery of Singapore,

second from right, to enrich our conversation for another hour and a half.

Looking at this issue of private and public, public and private, it seems to have a great diversity according to different regions, different times, different stages in the development of institutions. Perhaps rather than the issue of institutions being public or private we would need to see what problem we are dealing with here and what really matters. So, I will start with some of the responses from Fionn and Eugene from the morning session, and then continue.

May I begin with Fionn? What is your response, not from a museum but from an art centre, and bearing in mind too the differences between American and European systems of collecting and governing?

Fionn Meade: Yes, sure. Well, what Kate offered in part at the beginning of her presentation about a lot of the museums in the States having been founded by patrons who had private collections is correct, so a private beginning and a gradual move towards board governance is true of the Walker (hence the name Walker, T. B. Walker), and we're actually celebrating the institution's seventy-fifth year. The seventy-five years consider when T. B. Walker offered his collection and building to the twin cities as an art centre—he actually said, 'Do you want it as a centre?' and the response was 'Yes'. That led to a movement towards the kind of multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary production and commission-oriented work that certainly Martin Friedman and Kathy Halbreich, who as you all know, were leading figures in that regard over a period of almost thirty years, in the case of Martin, and more like seventeen in that of Kathy. But there is a moment, inevitably, when the collecting of the Walker reached a point of intentionality and, we could say verticality of resonance and trajectories that then led to the Walker becoming a museum. In essence, Bernard also reflected on this, as the Centre Pompidou has the museum of modern art embedded in it. In this case, the art centre reached a point where, in a sense, it also took on the responsibility of a museum, and since then has continued to collect work in a very artist-centred way, with a focus on the terms of production of its time. I bring this up to say that there is a surprising kind of overlapping element in those two things that Kate mentioned in her reference to the private turning into the public, and also in Bernard's presentation regarding the national museum being in essence embedded in the art centre. and in some ways a challenge to make it more visible again, to surface it in a different way, as he was saying. If you've been to the Pompidou it's tangible—in a way, it seems as if it's been elided in the structure of the architecture. Those are just a couple of thoughts, although there are perhaps more points of shared or mutual comprehension. It's not so divisive in that regard. I think it's about finding how to narrativise these questions.

Mami Kataoka: Thank you Fionn. I would like to invite Eugene Tann, not only because he's the director of the forthcoming National Art Gallery in Singapore but because he's the Programme Director at the Singapore Economic Development Board, and has contributed to the development of the cluster of galleries and art institutions called the Gillman Barracks, where Ute Meta Bauer's gallery

is. This is another example or model of a museum situated within a larger cultural policy. You could probably talk about the different conditions of museums in South East Asia in general.

Eugene Tann: Yes, I'm going to try and relate part of what we've been discussing to the context of South East Asia. Contemporary art was one of the main ways in which art was introduced to publics in South East Asia, and as witnessed by many public institutions in many countries in the region, this was done primarily through the market, through auctions, art fairs. Because of the way in which the market does this, the contemporary is de-linked from history, so the publics that are beginning to learn about art from the contemporary art market do not get a sense of the history, of where the art is coming from. This is what I hope will change when we open next year, as our focus is very much on the art histories of Singapore and South East Asia from the nineteenth century up to the present. In addition to presenting these art histories, we also seek to connect them to other parts of the world, hence the project that Bernard and I are working on together. This sense of history is therefore one of the results of how art has been introduced to the publics in South East Asia through the market. Another result of that is that the publics don't really understand the value of what art is, and it's important to know that the private sector has played an important role in developing the arts in South East Asia, primarily through artist-run initiatives. Artists in this part of the world have been working without public support, by and large, for most of the second half of the twentieth century. Public support only came in around the nineteen nineties in countries like Singapore. So it's very hard to draw the distinction between private and public in this respect, when many of these artist-run initiatives engage in commercial activities in order to support these activities.

As Mami mentioned, I also thought of the development of Gillman Barracks district in Singapore, consisting of international galleries as well as the Centre for Contemporary Art that Ute is now running. It was a recognition that in order for the art scene in Singapore, and indeed in South East Asia, to grow, major parts of a holistic ecosystem (a term that has been used a lot during these discussions) need to be in place. One of these is the commercial art scene, primarily dominated by auctions and art fairs and where the role of galleries had been very much overlooked. Hence this was an attempt to bring the role of galleries into the ecosystem. The last thing I would like to say is that when considering private commercial activities, it's very important to look specifically at how they relate to the local context. One example I would like to discuss is Art Jak, which is an art fair set up in

Jakarta, one of the main art cities in Indonesia. While it's a commercial art fair, I was at the opening last year and the audience was for me really amazing, it was like going to a rock concert! There were thousands and thousands of young people, students, an audience I could only dream of having for my museum. So we should not underestimate the effects that these events or platforms have for creating audiences for art, even if they seem kind of commercial and not in line with our idea of public art institutions.

Mami Kataoka: Thank you. Maybe I'll start looking at what could be the possible common ground whatever the scheme of governance of the museum, according to different political and social systems in different regions of the world. I would like to pick up the word sustainability that I think some speakers discussed. Bernard talked about the quality of the exhibition and Luiz Augusto talked about [the endurance of] art works, or art, after our lifetime. So, how can we sustain the activity of the museum in terms of funding, human resources and public interest? Perhaps it's too broad [a subject], but again this relates to what Kate is trying to do, injecting energy into education, archiving, etc. So if we don't look at where funding comes from, or who is sustaining institutions financially, what are we looking at? What do we need to keep, to sustain, in museum activity? Could someone comment on this? Kate?

Kate Fowle: I'll start. I'm sure there are many answers to this. For me, it comes down to the fact that if you're starting from a place where you're beginning something, rather than walking into a situation that is already established, you really do need to think about how to sustain your staff, in terms of training and giving them expectations as to where they're going with things. You need to sustain an audience, and that means, as I was saying, giving them access to knowledge and the agency to ask questions. If they understand the institution as somewhere where they are expected to be passive, then I don't know how you're going to make the institution grow, because this ecosystem you're talking about is also an ecosystem of people feeling that something that could belong to them, even if it doesn't yet. I'd love to know how these institutions entered into the public imaginary, and I think maybe you could talk of this in terms of Detroit and how it obviously did enter the public imaginary in some way. I don't know if it's language, I don't know if it's getting used to something, but it is about sustaining to be able to even get there.

KM: I would like to hear from Bernard, how could you elaborate on the quality of being sustained?

Bernard Blistène: Well, in my opinion a situation is never established, never, and the danger would really be to consider that something can be

established. Looking back at the history of Musée national d'art moderne, as you know, it was one of two wings of a former building in another district of Paris, and when President Pompidou decided to move it to the centre of the capital, you know what happened—the situation changed for ever. The other step was, as we said before, that the Musée national d'art moderne became part of a multicultural centre. This was a chance, but it was also a challenge, because the building cost a huge amount of money. And because the museum is precisely able to bring resources to the museum itself—the money doesn't come from the other department, it's the other department that costs money—the equilibrium between the position of the Musée national d'art moderne inside the building and the Pompidou itself constitutes a deep challenge. The third point is that the Musée national d'art moderne, our colleagues and curators are all very lucky to work in such a building, because we know how successful this building has been, how these critical devices which, as you know, lie at the roots of Centre Pompidou have helped the Musée national d'art moderne become what it is. Yet the worst thing would be to think that we have to stabilise something—we can't!

Who cared about globalisation when the Pompidou opened in 1977? Who cared about forming a collection that did not reflect a fight between European and American culture? Who cared about reconsidering the narrative as we all tried to do? But the thing is to fix a position. As I said this morning, first of all this has to be an alternative to the domination of the art market which, as we all know, is exerting a pressure, but it also has to propose an alternative to the American narrative which for so long has been the model of what I would call cultural domination. So this alternative is a big challenge but, and this is the fifth point: such an alternative can't be attained without a link between the institution itself and research, the university, and what is definitely the space where you think and deal with art history. It seems to me that an institution really has to be redefined and yet accept that there is an art history. Of course, such an art history has to be remodelled, it has to be criticised, but if you work in an institution as a curator you cannot pretend that that is ultimately your target. If you forget that you are totally lost, and as the title of the famous film, *Lost in Translation*. Yes, it makes sense. Of course, for French culture the objective is to forget this paranoia of the fight between American and European culture. And, once again, to deconstruct—I'm French, so deconstruction is my dream you know—and to rearticulate something which is not of course stable. It is totally unstable. If you think that it's stable, you're Hegelian, so can we be Hegelian today?

Mami Kataoka: Thank you.

Kate Fowle: Can I just ask? In your presentation, you said that when you were thinking through what you were going to do with Eugene, you didn't want to present the same old Chagall—i.e., there is a way for you to develop an interest for different works. I feel it's very important to understand the history or the canon that you're talking about, but also to add in other histories. Maybe we should be talking about histories, because it's important to understand, as some people were saying on day one, how we start to write our own histories that can be put alongside some of these, so that there actually is a different way of seeing. This is related to your idea of not being stable, but I think there should be a way of adding these new histories.

Bernard Blistène: I do agree with what you say, but it seems to me that we all have to know where we stand. We're not just talking randomly—we're talking from a specific position, for better or worse. In my case, I know that I'm talking from a national institution that has the responsibility of summarising our culture from the beginning of the twentieth century to today. I know what we've missed, and what we're still missing, but I don't mind missing things. It seems to me that the more precise we can be, the deeper we can delve into what we think should be developed, the better we will be. But as we all know, the thing is that all such institutions around the world seem to have the same problems, which is not true at all. There are quite a lot of differences, even in France, between Paris and other regions. I spent six years of my life in the south of France, where we built things (with some of my friends who are here and were involved with the institutions as patrons), and we know that it's not stable at all. When I left, I thought that I could fix something. Ask my friends, who are here in the fifth row, what they think about what happened later! So it's all about this instability, which I think we should reflect more on.

Kate Fowle: I just want to ask one other thing, as I think it's very important to hear your perspective. 1989 is twenty-five years ago this year, and many museums, no matter what scale—although especially large-scale museums—around the world are trying to consider this kind of moment, addressing what is in their collections in relation to such a moment, when we all know something shifted. We all have different perspectives on what that was, and different stories. I wonder if you could just talk about this a bit as I know that you've made (well not you personally, but the Pompidou has made) an exhibition that is trying to deal with this. I know that MoMA is, I know that the Tate is interested in it. I'm just wondering, because this is a time when suddenly these histories are coming together—looking at the collections and actually

thinking through how to present that kind of rupture in time, through the collections.

Bernard Blistène: I don't understand what you mean with rupture, what kind of rupture are you talking about?

Kate Fowle: I mean with the status quo, what was happening with the fall of communism, the changes in government, the ways in which the world was actually working. This coincided with social, political and cultural events that were taking place in the world and that were also reflected in the art world and in the people participating in it, in the artists. There's been a big question in terms of collecting internationally, or just reflecting on it, in the case of a temporary exhibition.

Bernard Blistène: Well, I guess maybe you're talking about the display of the permanent collection, which is actually on view, which tried to summarise what we had acquired during one century from all over the world. When you look precisely at what has been done, [you see that] these are deeply individual histories. It was not a political matter of fact; there was not really any political involvement. Quite a lot of people within what we call the Ministère de la Culture [Ministry of Culture], the curators, those described as *fonctionnaires* [civil servants] were involved in different aspects of collecting, of artistic situations, and what you see is the result of this mixture. It's not the result of a political *volonté* [will]. The political will didn't exert any pressure on acquisitions, thank God! And in a way it's funny to see that the public pressure is, of course, less powerful than private pressure. So I do prefer to have less money than some big private institutions to preserve the possibility of deciding what we acquire, than to be under the pressure of patrons who are going to fix the position and decide for you what you have to push. These are perhaps the limits, but nobody is perfect. It seems to me that there are still more possibilities of articulating something with such a structure than to be linked, let's say, to the power of money.

Mami Kataoka: I'd like to ask Fionn, although you can also respond to this conversation, but I thought that since it is some time since the Walker opened, what has been kept, besides the collection and activities, what remains? The spirit of the activities, perhaps? Or whether, as a regional art centre, maybe it was the community that has kept the Walker? And from there, to where you are now. Maybe you could comment on that.

Fionn Meade: Sure. When I brought up this kind of duality, I considered it as a kind of a tension, a productive, constructive tension—to be an art centre and a museum, and to have that as a kind of constantly revised proposition at the centre of an institutional mandate or mission, in a sense. When you look at the way that has shifted over time, it's

very interesting because it doesn't stay static. And I think that, to respond to the question about the sustainability of the museum, or what's sustainable, when we look at the inherited apparatus or the *dispositif* [device] of the museum, it is important to realise that we're considering that of out of that legacy I think there are some things (and Madeleine mentioned this yesterday) that we certainly don't want to let go of. One of those would be historical awareness, criteria, because out of criteria comes the possibility for critique, participation, returning (an audience that expects to return). There's much more, but I think that in those what you see is a vertical experience of a museum, and the inheritance of that [museum apparatus] is part of its strength. I think one of the questions here is that if we're in a moment when the museum, as a term, is going well beyond that inherited legacy, and being in some ways pushed and pulled and made to be very propositional and provisional, those central questions of the inherited museum apparatus need to be seen as in a shared dialogue with these changes in the expectations of museums.

So, in some ways, it is very important to see the sustainable question for museums with collections and archives as having a dialogical relationship with other contexts that are actually experimenting with the term museum. I bring that up because the Walker, as I said, was an art centre: it was a private collection, then it was an art centre, and in essence it became a museum through its production. Its production took it to the institutional precipice, and then in a sense it had a kind of internal logic that the institution had to respond to, because the collection was of a certain size and of a certain complexity, it had certain needs. I think it's interesting to think of that kind of trajectory as being in some ways (maybe I'm exaggerating) more indicative of the American museum, in a sense. And when Bernard was talking about the nation-state responsibility of a museum, they have different terms and come from very different genealogies. Let's just put it that way.

Bernard Blistène: Well but you know, to be frank, as I said, the Pompidou is a sum of four departments. Do you think that these departments work together? Of course not! The truth is that that is pure fiction. For example, a week ago we invited the great Michael Fried to give a lecture and the theatre was almost empty. I can't understand why people who were supposed to be there didn't attend, and I was extremely shocked by the fact that my curators didn't attend. I wanted to know where the problem resided. Perhaps the problem resided in the fact that the connection which we have to preserve, to establish even, between our programme of activities, exhibitions, whatever, and all the other things, has been completely broken. The first step I took when I took up this position—which is a huge

responsibility—was to try to plug the artistic and the cultural activities together. I considered that being inside a cultural centre was a challenge, not a difficulty. Even if I have to assume the fact that what we call pluridisciplinarity or interdisciplinarity is a great expectation and a big illusion. In another step, I tried to create a small festival inside Centre Pompidou to mix disciplines. I didn't mix anything by myself, I asked the artists who were involved in this way of thinking to act, to perform and to develop different things. It seems to me that when, like today, we hold this kind of meetings, we always forget the artists. I think the first thing to reconsider is not our own position inside the institution, but the position of the artist versus the institution.

Luiz Augusto Teixeira de Frietas: Can I make a comment? It's a comment and then a question to you as well. Starting precisely from what you've just said about the artist, and going back to what you mentioned earlier in your presentation about the opening of the huge new Louis Vuitton space and how this will maybe affect your funds in a small percentage, because they will probably concentrate funds in their own space, if I understood correctly you said just now that if the government were able to give you 1% of the budget, you would rather work with this 1% than deal with all those corporate patrons. So my question is, What do you think of this Louis Vuitton space, of other major corporate spaces and of individuals who build huge mausoleums, the new pyramids of [art]? I don't want to be provocative just for the sake of being provocative, it's just that I want to understand if the art is really the main objective of these spaces. Do you think that Paris will gain, in terms of culture and art, with spaces such as the Louis Vuitton? Is it something that will be added to the cultural panorama of Paris?

Bernard Blistène: Definitely, yes. Definitely. The thing is that what you see first when you see the Louis Vuitton Foundation is the Frank Gehry building, which is spectacular. It will be interesting in a few years time to compare the Pompidou building, as a spectacular critical machine, with the Vuitton building, to see where the difference lies in terms of the functioning of the two institutions. I would like to say that for me the Louis Vuitton Foundation is this beautiful, spectacular achievement of Gehry's work. The challenge will be [posed by] what is inside. As we've known for a while, there has always been a competition between the container, the building itself, and what is inside it, the contents. Quite a lot of institutions have been built for the container and, like you, I've seen quite a lot of institutions call themselves museums and yet they have no collections, they have simply been built as spectacular statements for politicians. Let's wait and see what the Louis Vuitton develops with artists over

the next few years. The Vuitton's objective is to work with artists, to commission works from artists.

We have a great responsibility, and on the other hand, the artists have their responsibility. Responsibility is for me the key point. Then you can talk about public and private, or whatever. The key is the philosophical question of responsibility. Earlier on, we talked about existentialism, but we know what it is linked to. Today, however, the word we need to consider is *responsabilité*—*la communauté* and *la responsabilité*, the community and the responsibility, if you want to be serious.

Mami Kataoka: Yes, I think it's very important to look at responsibility, at what you do, and T different types of organisations, [different types] of funding structures in what you do and in your responsibilities. Particularly within a large city like Paris or New York. When there are different museums, how do you differentiate between them? But I was struck with this cross-disciplinary festival that you organised Bernard, because looking at Fionn's title, Senior Curator of Cross-Disciplinary Platforms, I think that could probably initiate a vision at the Walker.

Fionn Maede: Yes. I mean, I'm head of the Visual Arts Department and also Senior Curator of Cross-Disciplinary Platforms, and all of these are part of the common responsibilities of the Artistic Director of the Walker. It was partly an internal messaging, in a sense to respond to what Bernard was asking about whether departments work together. He said 'Absolutely not', and yet his festival created a format where that could indeed happen. In this case, you're using the convention of a title to message the fact that expertise that works in isolation within an institution is not really acceptable. To return to the artistic role, artists work in ways where they expect mixed formats. They expect to work in a stage situation, in a gallery situation, in a discursive platform as something that updates the autonomy of art works. In part, this is a responsiveness to the way artists produce and expect to present their work. And that even pervades this notion of public and private. Artists work with Vuitton and Pompidou, and the FRAC or whatever, just to mention the French context.

This takes me to something that Hito was saying. Maria, too, was mentioning the deferred value that smaller organisations cultivate through an artistic sensibility that often needs to be acknowledged more from larger institutions. The time between it being presented by the small institution and the large institution has shrunk. In the institutional context, I think we could ask ourselves what deferred velocity means. If there is anything that needs to happen between institutions, that is a shared agenda or a shared conversation, which is perhaps when, in a way, we defer speeding up the

expectation of the contemporary and actually allow for a different sort of elongation of time. Perhaps that deferred velocity is something that distinguishes the institutional responsibility from the foundation, from the art fair and the biennial which don't really have that task or that role to play. I also think that the interdisciplinary, the cross-disciplinary, is very much a response to artistic production, not just to institutional initiatives or agendas but to the way work is being made and presented.

Bernard Blistène: A very important word is value. Where do we find value today? What kind of value are we talking about?

Mami Kataoka: Well, I'll take that point too, to talk about collections. What are we collecting? Particularly in the case of institutions, one of their responsibilities could be collecting documentation and archival material, performative practices that aren't really associated with the market system but are actually a huge part of art history. I would like to ask Eugene, now that you're building a national gallery, I assume that you're building a national, historical collection?

Eugene Tan: Yes, the collection that will be showing in our museum is the national collection. The portion in our custody will probably be of 8000 works, from the nineteenth century to the present, and our primary focus is Singapore and South East Asia. This notion of the archive and documentation is something that we're also thinking about and developing, as we realise that it is an important part of the history of the region. We're also trying to establish stronger links between the two in how we present the archive and the exhibitions. Both the archive and the collection were always considered very much a dichotomy—collections being about preservation and archives being about enabling research and knowledge—but our curators are thinking about ways to link the two and break down the distinction. So we're collecting archives as well, and in some cases presenting them as part of the history of art in the narrative that we are building.

Mami Kataoka: Maybe Kate, would you like to comment on building an archive centre?

Kate Fowle: Well, it's a specific context but it's also something important to think about in relation to the word museum, because if you consider it as a repository of experience, then the archive is the closest thing you're going to get to evidence, if you like, of the experience that artists have had, the ways in which journalists have responded, the way in which an art community actually exists or doesn't exist. Particularly because of the market, or of the absence of the market, as in some respects is the case with many artists in Russia. If we don't start to look at what it is that actually happened and find ways of presenting that material, different pieces of evidence to back up the

fact that an artist said 'I did this but it could be underground', or 'I did this but the works no longer exist because of the political situation', then an archive is truly fundamental. It's really really important to start to build a kind of collective memory of the institution.

Mami Kataoka: Thank you. Given that there is half an hour left, I would like to open the discussion to you all.

## Questions and Answers

Mami Kataoka: Frances Morris, in the front row.

Frances Morris: I'd just like to suggest that we continue with this discussion for a moment, because I think that we're beginning to touch on the responsibilities of public institutions, or aspiring public institutions, in relation to collecting, and it seems to me that there is a consensus around our responsibilities towards the public, our responsibilities to art and its value, and to history. And I think that we're all, in our different ways, small and large institutions, addressing what constitutes history now, at this moment in time, for our different audiences in a changing world. But we also have a private collector on the stage, and I'd like to ask Luiz, What are the responsibilities attached to collecting outside the public sector? Do you feel the same moral obligation to put together a coherent collection? Does it need to address history? Does it need to be equitable? Or can it be pure indulgence? What are our responsibilities, in a way, to address the same kind of questions that our institutional colleagues are addressing?

Luiz Augusto Teixeira de Freitas: I can only talk about myself of course, but for me to collect is definitely one hundred per cent responsibility. In the case of the works in my collection, my first responsibility is with the artist. During my lifetime I am merely holding these works of art for the future. I like living with the works of art that I collect. I lend them extensively. They are completely open — not open to be seen at my home or at my office, but open to be lent to the public, to public institutions. I think that is one hundred per cent the responsibility that I have, first of all with the artist and then with the art work. I feel that I am only the trustee of the works of art that I own.

Frances Morris: I presume that you are aware of a word that I think hasn't been mentioned in this forum yet, and that's provenance. And of course the provenance of a work of art, where it comes from, through whose hands it has passed also affects value, not just the cultural value but the market value too.

Luiz Augusto Teixeira de Freitas: But in that sense, I don't know how...

Frances Morris: I suppose it's that bigger question of responsibility, that a work of art that enters into a particular collection is then sort of reconfigured by that collection, by its adjacency to other works of art, by the histories and the context of that collection. I just wondered whether you could comment on whether that enters into your decision-making process.

Luiz Augusto Teixeira de Freitas: Yes, you see that's interesting because I've changed and am now in the process of changing this idea precisely. For a certain number of years I was working with a curator who guided me, but the idea was to build a coherent collection that one day in the future could be shown to the public as something that has been built. So the idea was to... it's difficult to say in English because we use the same word, but in Portuguese or in French you would have a distinction between collecting with the purpose of building a collection, and gathering things over the course of a lifetime, things that we like and that at a certain moment, twenty, thirty or forty years later, would be seen as a collection. Let's say, for instance, that you're a jazz fan and you buy jazz DVDs throughout your life. You don't have the intention of building a jazz collection but, thirty years on, you look back at your shelf and see that you have a collection. What I did was not that, and I think that this second idea is more interesting than the first from a personal, individual perspective. What I did the first ten years was build a collection, a structured collection, with the idea of bringing together a series of works that would make sense with each other. I understand that this phase is over, and now I just want to continue buying things that I like though not necessarily with this responsibility of coherence. Maybe one day I'll look back and see that I have a collection.

I first read about this idea from a catalogue, and then I had a brief conversation with a collector, the collector I admire the most and who is still alive, Herman Daled, and this is exactly what he was saying. He had never had any intention to build a collection, he would just talk to friends, most of whom were artists, and would start buying things. In the end, when he stopped buying things (which happened to be when Broodthaers died) he realised that he had built a collection, but it was not deliberate. So I like to make this distinction, and now I'm trying to be in this second phase, buying more freely and not necessarily with a coherence with what I've bought previously.

Mami Kataoka: Luiz Augusto, may I just ask, since you mentioned that you want your art [collection] to continue even after your lifetime, have you ever thought where the collected works could eventually go? [Laughter]

Luiz Augusto Teixeira de Freitas: No. I don't have any plans for then, that will be up to my children, who I think are also responsible, and they will decide what to do.

Antonia Alampi: Hi. I'm Antonia Alampi from Beirut, in Cairo. I would like to go back to a question that Kate was posing that has to do with responsibility towards the writing of histories. There seems to be a general consensus emerging about the role of the museum in the writing of art history and establishing a canon. So in this sense, I wonder whether the parameters of this writing we're making shouldn't be discussed and questioned, given that they seem to me to be increasingly questionable and fluent. Who is actually writing? Who is taking responsibility for these histories? When Kate was talking about 1989, I cannot but think of *Magiciens de la terre* and a lot of very colonial cultural practices that have been brought forward by institutions for a very long time. What responsibility do we have today towards the colonial activity of the past and the still often extremely colonial cultural practices of the present? I think we should acknowledge that the need for different perspectives and multiple writing of histories is extremely important because, again, these massive museums and institutions have a huge responsibility.

Kate Fowle: I just want to add one more thing to that list, and that's something that I've discovered and was thinking about when the question was posed on the first day. What I'm learning is that it has to work two ways: history has to be written with the people who are making it and with the younger generations, in the language in which it is happening; then it has to be translated into another language (whether that's Spanish, French, English) and shared, otherwise the histories don't get placed together. Once we start to do that, when we start to think about the way that we communicate knowledge about something, or talk among people who actually have a shared experience at least of the context of those histories, then the use of language, what is said and how it's said, is completely different.

Fionn Meade: On the question of writing histories, I think that certain shows like *Magiciens de la terre* are always used as examples, but what about a show like *Ostalgia*, which purports to tell the story of the former Soviet bloc and is funded by one Russian patron? When we talk about how we're going to narrativise history, I think we have a reticence to talk about the projects that are actually being done within our collegial circle, and maybe too often look back at certain case studies.

Antonia Alampi: Or *Here and Elsewhere*, at the New Museum?

Frances Morris: Yes, or *Here and Elsewhere*, a similar case, also funded primarily by one patron, skipping or going around a certain expectation of

museum practice. That's actually very interesting, because it's being purported as writing the history of now.

Bernard Blistène: Well, it seems to me that if I talk about responsibility I have to be responsible and I must, in a way, answer your question, which was not a question but addressed *Magiciens de la terre*.

Antonia Alampi: Not only that.

Bernard Blistène: Not only, but you took it as an example and I can answer. If you remember, both Catherine David and I had in a way to leave Centre Pompidou where we were curators at the time of *Magiciens de la terre*. We were against the show, and we thought, as you said, that the show was a colonial exhibition. And what was the result? Catherine David left (thank God she's back!) and went to Jeu de Paume, and I had to leave, but luckily for me, I went to Marseille. Which means that this question of responsibility is also inside the institution, between the people [who work there]. You must know that in an institution such as Centre Pompidou there are different levels of responsibility: one is *le président*, the president, who is the politician in charge of the different departments; the others are the directors and the curators. In my opinion, the debate inside the institution has to be stimulated much more than it is at present.

I'm totally against *la parole unique* [the unique word], but it seems to me that *Magiciens de la terre* marked a turning point which, twenty-five years later, we need to consider as a symptom. I'm not so sure whether celebrating *Magiciens de la terre* during a *université d'été* [a summer university] twenty-five years later was really the answer to the question. But if you want to keep this degree of self-responsibility, you also need to consider the institution as a platform to discuss these things as I am now doing in front of you — not towards you but in front of you.

Kate Fowle: Just to add one thing though, what's interesting is that I never thought I'd be the person to defend *Magiciens de la terre*, because I never usually do, but it was the first time that many artists had international exposure. For the Chinese artists who were in *Magiciens de la terre*, for instance, it was the first time that they had actually shown abroad.

Bernard Blistène: I'm not so sure about that. I'm sure about the fact that quite a number of artists had never had an exhibition in a *musée national d'art moderne occidental* [a Western national museum of modern art].

Kate Fowle: I mention the Chinese example because I know directly from them.

Bernard Blistène: You're very right when you say that quite a lot of artists had never had their work shown before, but the structure of the show, the relationship between Western and non-Western

should be discussed today. I don't think that what we did twenty-five years later, a few months ago, was the perfect answer. This is something that I want to say, and I have no problem in discussing it in front of you.

Mami Kataoka: Eugene, would you like to comment on that, because you're now building not only Singapore's history but South-East Asian history.

ET: Yes, we thought very hard about how we were going to go about writing the art histories for the region, given that we are only one of ten or more countries. But at the same time, given the under-researched nature of South-East Asian art, we felt that we were a starting point and we realised that this history, or these histories, that we are writing constitute an ongoing process that has to start somewhere, and present what we understand it to be at this point in time before we start questioning it in order to evaluate and refine how we understand these different histories.

Olga Sviblova: We're discussing the topic of the relationships between public institutions and private institutions, but when talking about museums we should start with collections before going on to *kunsthallen* and different art centres. Basically we're talking about collections, which are the foundation of art history. In his poems, Russian poet Parschikov was writing history — history will be written by the last to be born. This is true, and reveals how an institution such as the Tetryakov Gallery or the Pushkin Museum have changed the name of their collections. So, the Pushkin Museum would know that it was [previously] the Museum of Stalin or the Tetryakov Gallery that only collected Social Realism, then timidly started to open up to the Russian avant-garde, and then the department for new contemporary art, which was underground before it had had the chance to be shown. So, when public collections are created today, my question is how are we buying works? Who decides which acquisitions will make history? Where is the history? Here I agree totally with Bernard that storage space could become increasingly larger if we go on collecting and collecting, for this gives future generations the possibility of writing their own history, their own versions — we need to give them this possibility to see what we are doing. When acquisitions are made by private institutions, to a certain extent they have more money and to a certain extent they have more freedom. Sometimes the choices are made by individual people, and at other times they are made by a small group of the collector's friends and advisers. When it is institutions that are buying works, they have different acquisition boards or commissions, and when these change, this change can be reflected in our opinions. Sometimes we depend on the government (now, for instance, we are waiting for a new government), on political decisions, which are

really private decisions too. So, where is the difference? Can different institutions come together to offer a common history? And how can we open our collections? I think this was a very interesting topic in Bernard's discussion. How can we make collections more accessible through CIMAM? How can we open up local contexts? Because we are, of course, looking for art that will not be conditioned by our own vision. How can we understand the meaning of national collections, international collections, private and public?

Bernard Blistène: Let me tell you something. At a certain point, it's becoming more difficult to refuse gifts than to accept them. Does that make sense? It's incredible! I would never have imagined that it would take me longer, days and days, to refuse gifts than to accept them. Perhaps I was naïve, but it is something that in a way follows on from what we said this morning and which is the key to our debate, which is private and public. We all know that most art dealers now agree to sell a work to a private collector, and that the same collector agrees to give another to an institution. It's a plot! It's a family plot, by the way. But, how can we resist these invaders? I must tell you that after three committees, it took me longer to find the words to explain to people who knew exactly why they wanted to give us works that we were refusing the works [than it would have taken] to accept them.

So, that's why in a way I would love to return to archives and all the things we were discussing earlier. Especially if you've been involved with Conceptual Art and such practices, it is no longer possible to separate collecting such works from collecting visual arts. For me, everything has to come together. From Bartomeu and Manolo (and I miss Manolo today of course) I learnt that a museum, in order to be a museum, has to have vitrines. I remember Bartomeu and Manolo saying, 'We do these vitrines because we don't have a collection'. [Laughter]. But in any event, we know that this articulation, these connections between vitrines, between what we call archives — which is now perhaps becoming a wrong word, like *cinéma doc* or *documentaire*, [doc or documentary film] that means nothing when we see what is happening in film today — and all these roots have to be explored, and may perhaps help us understand deeply what we have to do and what we have to refuse. So for me, collecting today definitely means becoming more and more involved in the process of making art, of criticising art, and all these materials are on the same level. The question will be how to exhibit, how to display them and how to make them accessible. One of the great challenges of our institution, or institutions, is really to use all kinds of supports — the Internet or whatever — to make these things accessible.

Fionn Meade: And I think that's a very important question. When we talk about digital shifts, the idea isn't just say putting things online. As we all know, beacon technology with tablets and phones is the area in which museums are really going to need to go. And the user, the audience, is not going to scroll through and choose from an online [offer] but, in a sense, they'll want to be given an option to select or reject a certain archival presence in relation to the actual experience of the gallery, an art work or a performance. I don't think of it as a problem but as a real opportunity for institutions that have archival memory to surface something, to bring a kind of verticality to the thinning of culture, which is our digital time. We're actually experiencing a very different moment to the one we were experiencing ten years ago as regards how we can surface really meaningful content in a very immediate user-friendly way. And I consider that to be a museum responsibility, and a new advantage I would say. Because accelerationism isn't really what we're talking about... Kate, you went from art centre to museum in seven years, that's pretty fast!

Kate Fowle: I just want to say that there's a woman from the book section of the Bremen archive. Bremen has this incredible archive [Bremen State Archive], which I think is one very good example. We've heard other examples from the Arab Image Foundation, but there's somebody out there who has an amazing archive!

Michelle Wong: Hi, I'm Michelle Wong and I work for Asia Art Archives, so I'm based in Hong Kong. What really struck me just now, when we were beginning to talk about exhibitions, is that museums don't only write histories through their collections but also through the exhibitions they hold. And these exhibitions are not only meaningful for the museum itself, but also for the artists they bring in and leave out. If you take China as an example, perhaps I would agree that *Magiciens de la terre* was the first time those artists travelled, but it was also a very real opportunity for them to actually get out of the country. And if they had stayed, things would have been different. And also 1989, in terms of exhibition history... I'm sure there were different exhibitions that were important to different places. There are thick and thin histories, and in one way or another we all remember our art histories through exhibitions. In China we remember it by *China Avant-Garde* in 1989, which now has a different momentum of its own, being historicised and shown, and it's spiralled out of control. What I would like to raise is whether we can think of exhibitions as the site of constructing art history. That would also be quite interesting, and it gives a different cut into what archives are, what exhibition files are. In places where there is only a young museum tradition or a museum collection, these archives or these

exhibition files are what you go back to build up what your understanding of art history is and can be. Making them available, whether physically or digitally, is an extremely powerful tool in which we strongly believe and practice at Art Asia, our archive. We're now restaging historical exhibitions as well, so what does that mean? I have a question for Kate actually: How do you plan to make the archive that you are building available? In what form and to whom?

Kate Fowle: The archive basically is alive, it's constantly growing, and it's from today — it's been 'from today' since the nineteen nineties, which means it's also people who also have memories of the past and things before the nineteen nineties that need to be collected to contextualise what each of those 'days' are. So we decided that exhibitions are the first way that we need to start to activate the archive and to cross-pollinate. There are many works that are not from the archive that we can gather together to make more sense of the archive. We've made a publication, there's an online platform, all the usual [elements] and then there's a process of digitisation going on. The NCCA [National Centre for Contemporary Arts] has an archive, which is another part of the story. It also started in the nineteen nineties, and there are other archives in different places in Russia and we want to keep those separate and, with places like Bremen, try to create a network. We can't do it alone either, because there is no one archive that is the final story. So, it's about trying to create a network to ensure access, but there are also bigger parts of the story that can be told over time.

Mami Kataoka: I can take only one more question. I see two hands.

Reema Fada: My question is to the panel. I come from a collecting institution, one that is soon going to be built, the Guggenheim Abu Dhabi, and we deal with issues of looking at histories in particular places, especially the Middle East. I think there is a question of responsibility that we need to start to ask ourselves about object collecting versus archives. But how do you start to tell an equal side of the story when, for example, a lot of that art history of certain objects or art works is non-existent, or is in a very bad state and conserving them is practically impossible? And then you are collecting worldwide, in a certain kind of semantics of collecting objects, but it's non-equitable in terms of how you portray them. This is a real problem, something that should be explained about that kind of history. How do you retain that language of equity that we are all striving for in terms of corrective histories, given that the semantics of object collecting come from a language of modernisation build-up that was not practiced at an equal level around the world?

Mami Kataoka: Who would like to answer?

Bernard Blistène: Well, something simple. It's not a joke, but let's say that maybe the answer lies, once again, in the practices of the artists themselves. If we look back to when Akram Zaatari decided to build an archive, for example, or if we look at Marcel Broodthaers, who also dealt with archives, or at many other Conceptual artists, I think the answer has to be particular, as you say. Particular contexts and particular situations. But for a while, this idea of archives was considered by artists too—*La Boîte-en-valise* is, in a way, an archive—so it seems to me that quite a lot of answers belong to the artists.

Kate Fowle: Reema, what is the Guggenheim's perspective on that? For somebody in the position that I'm in at the moment, it's really good to hear what different organisations are doing and what they're saying about this, particularly organisations that people might listen to. How they advocate for ways of trying to shift how the archive can begin to tell a story that has otherwise disappeared, or relates a different kind of modernisation. If larger-scale organisations aren't saying that this is of the essence, then it's going to be really difficult to make it the centre of the story. So, can you say what the Guggenheim is doing?

Reema Fada: Well, I can't say anything! [Laughter] However, I can definitely say that it's a question that remains, although we don't necessarily have the right solutions. It's a very big challenge. Of course, some recent artists are going back to these archives, but then what can I do with Shakir Hassan Al Said for instance? He's no longer alive, his works have either been looted or faked, and he's an incredibly important contemporary artist who has taught generations, and yet we don't have that immense history and so are unable to organise even one single retrospective. Where do we go from there? We can't even begin to address the question in exhibition making, collecting or building, and won't be able to show the scale or the propensity of that kind of thought. It can of course be done through certain archives or publications, but if you are a collecting institute, how do you face those dilemmas? I mean, these are real challenges, and I would say that the semantics of how we deal with object collecting in museums has to be rethought on a larger scale, because there is a certain legacy from where it comes. But I do not have any solutions as of yet.

Bernard Blistène: Again, an artist gives one specific answer to what you say: Tino Sehgal.

Q: I'm a fan too!

Bernard Blistène: Yes, okay. But it's not being tricky; it's the way to consider and to reconsider what you were questioning.

Mami Kataoka: Thank you very much. If you

agree, I would like to continue this discussion next year, because I really wanted to look at this idea of responsibility and how to sustain what we are doing in an ideal format. We began with the idea of public and private, private and public, but it's so diverse, from different regions and with different political structures in societies. It's not about public and private either; it's more about how to find the best solution to sustain the quality of the activity in different contexts. I also wanted to mention that in Japan, the first Museum of Modern Art opened as a public museum in 1951, followed by the National Museum of Modern Art in 1952. Both institutions declared that they would like to join the international network [of museums] after World War Two. So I think this kind of gathering in which we all meet—physically—is probably becoming far more important than it was twenty years ago, when the CIMAM conference was held in Tokyo in 1994. Gathering allows us to discover all these different structures of society and history, so I'm very much looking forward to continuing this conversation next year. I thank all the speakers very much. [Applause]

Bartomeu Mari: We are not going to read the PowerPoint; the information that is circulating behind us will be published on the website, so maybe Patricia could just run through the slides while I'm speaking.

First of all, you have seen that over these three days we have been together we have been substantially upgrading our context—if the conference were to run for one more day, the event would take place in the Royal Palace! Thank you to the organisers, our local partners, Mathaf, Abdallah Karroum and his team. I feel we have been very privileged to have these excellent speakers today, and also to have gathered an extraordinary audience composed of friends and colleagues. Another result of this conference is the teamwork of the board, elected by the members of the association a year ago. The teamwork has been incredible with Patricia [Sloane] and with the rest of members of the board, even those who unfortunately are not here today, with Jenny and Inés. If anything has gone wrong, it was my fault!

The different outlooks of the patrons who support us are other key elements of our activity. As you know, within the association I have had two priorities: one is the excellence of the debates, the quality of the ideas and the activities that we promote; and the other is the sustainability of the organisation. Patricia will give us some more thoughts on this sustainability and the state of our accounts. I just wanted to mention that we have had the pleasure of having with us Anne-Catherine Robert-Hauglustaine, Director General of ICOM, to signify a new stage of partnership with ICOM and bring it with greater energy into the future. Certainly

Anne-Catherine's nomination has been very positive for our partnership with ICOM, that will no doubt continue over the next years because of the many issues that are of interest to museums of modern and contemporary art, as well as for the larger community of museums of all kinds. Patricia.

Patricia Sloane: Yes. Just as a matter of information, as Bartomeu said, this information is all available online, both for members and non-members. We just wanted to go over the figures basically, to tell you that after the renewal which began as of one year ago, in terms of our membership we have reached almost 80% of our goal, with 376 registrations so far, and are aiming for 620. This includes individual memberships, institutional memberships—we have 45 institutions registered—and reduced individual membership for developing countries. We have also included our patrons and sustaining members, the former pay €3500 a year, and the latter pay €1500 a year. So far, with these new members, in 2014 we have reached a total income of almost €72000. Our expenses are more or less equal to that amount, as we have spent €73093 this year on the general expenses of running CIMAM, including the offices, the office expenses and the salaries.

As regards the conference, we have received incredible support from Qatar Museums and from Mathaf, which has helped make up for the deficit that we had finishing Rio. We will give a precise report on the finances of the conference, but we had a total registration of 218 delegates and 32 travel grantees, who were paid directly by the different institutions that support this initiative, and 58 participating countries. The cost per participant was €772. Our balance sheet for this month, November 2014, is €136.287 — as you can see, it is nothing like the financing of museums! [Laughter]

Bartomeu Mari: We're hopefully healthier! With a word of thanks, I think the next slide is the future of CIMAM meetings. We would also like to extend our thanks to the Mori Art Museum for its involvement. With the board of CIMAM, the Mori Art Museum will host and organise the 2015 conference. Needless to say, we hope to welcome you there with a fascinating number of excellent debates on the problems, ideas and issues that concern us in our day-to-day practice.

Before we dissolve into the landscape of Doha, I've been asked to ask you to gather here for a group photograph as if we were college graduates. I think it's a good idea to have a souvenir of this meeting. I would also like to remind you that an extraordinary work by Louise Bourgeois can be seen in the loBernard Blistèney of this Convention Centre, for those of you who haven't yet seen it. Obviously, if there are any questions, we would be happy to answer them now.

Q: Do you have the dates of the 2015 conference?

Bartomeu Mari: We don't have the exact dates yet, but it will be held at the end of November. We'll try to repeat the good habits we've acquired over time, but as soon as we have the details we'll post them, and communicate the dates to you all. No more questions? Then please join us for photo time! Thank you. [Applause]

---

# CIMAM

## International Committee for Museums and Collections of Modern Art

---

### *Board Members*

2014 – 2016

#### *President*

Bartomeu Marí

#### *Secretary-Treasurer*

Patricia Sloane

#### *Members*

Charles Esche

Ann Goldstein

Madeleine Grynsztejn

Kathy Halbreich

Philipp Kaiser

Abdellah Karroum

Mami Kataoka

Vasif Kortun

Kian Chow Kwok

Elizabeth Ann MacGregor

Frances Morris

Marcela Römer

Jaroslav Suchan

### *Founding Patrons*

Fundació Bancaria "la Caixa", Barcelona, Spain

Fundación Cisneros/Colección Patricia Phelps de

Cisneros, Caracas, Venezuela

Sammlung Falckenberg, Hamburg, Germany

Fukutake Foundation, Kagawa, Japan

Josée and Marc Gensollen, La Fabrique, Marseille,

France

Erika HofFrances Morrisann, Berlin, Germany

Fondation LVMH, Paris, France

Leeum, Samsung Museum of Art, Seoul, South

Korea

---

### *Sustaining Members*

Fundación Botín, Santander, Spain

Gwangju Biennale Foundation, Gwangju, South

Korea

Albert M.A. Groot, Sittard, Netherlands

Sherman Contemporary Art Foundation, Sydney,

Australia

Luiz Augusto Teixeira de Freitas, Lisbon, Portugal

---

### *Executive Director*

Jenny Gil Schmitz

### *Programmes Coordinator*

Inés Jover

### *Honorary Members*

Tuula Arkio

Zdenka Badovinac

Manuel J. Borja-Villel

Renilde Hamecher van der Brande

María de Corral

David Elliott

Rudi Fuchs

Olle Granath

Jürgen Harten

Thomas Messer (1920 – 2013)

Richard Oldenburg

Suzanne Pagé

Alfred Pacquement

Margit Rowell

CIMAM 2014 Annual  
Conference  
Museums in Progress: Public  
Interest, Private Resources?  
Mathaf: Arab Museum of  
Modern Art  
9 – 11 November, Doha, Qatar

---

*Hosted by*

Mathaf: Arab Museum of Modern Art, Doha, Qatar

*Organised by*

CIMAM in CIMAM in collaboration with Mathaf:  
Arab Museum of Modern Art

*Supported by*

Qatar Foundation  
Qatar Museums  
University College of London Qatar  
Qatar National Convention Center  
Museum of Islamic Art  
Katara Art Center, Collection TAJ  
QM Katara Gallery  
Fire Station Artists in Residence  
French Embassy in Doha  
W Doha Hotel & Residencies  
The St. Regis Doha

*Travel grants funded by*

Fundación Cisneros/Colección Patricia Phelps de  
Cisneros  
The Getty Foundation, Los Angeles  
Qatar Museums/Mathaf: Arab Museum of Modern  
Art

Qatar Airways was the official carrier of the CIMAM  
2014 Annual Conference

*Online publication by*  
CIMAM, Barcelona

*With the support of*

The Getty Foundation, Los Angeles  
Fundación Cisneros/Colección Patricia Phelps de  
Cisneros

*Editor*

Josephine Watson

*Graphic Designer*

Rogier Delfos

*Contributors*

Zeina Arida  
Graham W. J. Beal  
Bernard Blistène  
Kate Fowle  
Abdellah Karroum  
Kian Chow Kwok  
Maria Lind  
Elizabeth Ann MacGregor  
Bartomeu Marí  
Fionn Meade  
Ute Meta Bauer  
Salwa Mikdadi  
Frances Morris  
Gabi Ngcobo  
Rana Sadik  
Suha Shoman  
Eugene Tan  
Luiz Augusto Teixeira de Freitas  
Olav Velthuis

*Coordination*

Inés Jover

# CIMAM – International Committee for Museums and Collections of Modern Art

---

CIMAM  
Fabra i Coats  
C/ Sant Adrià, 20  
08030 Barcelona  
Spain  
[cimam.org](http://cimam.org)

© 2014 CIMAM International Committee for Museums and Collections of Modern Art and the authors. Unfortunately, we have not been granted permission to reproduce images of the conference or to print the presentation by Hito Steyerl. While all possible efforts have been made to contact copyright holders, if any omission or error is detected, it should be notified in writing in order to be corrected in subsequent editions. Kindly contact CIMAM.